

FIRST
R E P O R T

FROM THE

SELECT COMMITTEE

ON

FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND;

WITH THE

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

AND APPENDIX.

*Ordered, by The House of Commons, to be Printed,
12 May 1837.*

Luna, 6^o die Februarii, 1837.

Ordered, THAT a Select Committee be appointed to inquire how far the intentions of the Reform Bill are defeated by Creating and Registering Fictitious and Improper Votes in Ireland.

And a Committee was appointed of,—

Lord Granville Somerset.	Mr. Emerson Tennent.
Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer.	Mr. Aysbford Sanford.
Mr. Lefroy.	Mr. Milnes Gaskell.
Mr. O'Connell.	Mr. Strutt.
Mr. Hamilton.	Mr. Hogg.
Mr. Serjeant Bail.	Mr. Charles Villiers.
Mr. Serjeant Jackson.	Sir Robert Ferguson.
Mr. More O'Ferrall.	

Ordered, THAT the said Committee have power to send for Persons, Papers and Records.

Ordered, THAT FIVE be the Quorum of the Committee.

Veneris, 10^o die Februarii, 1837.

Ordered, THAT the Petition from Dublin, also the Petition of Thomas Henly, complaining of creating Fictitious Votes in Ireland, be referred to the said Committee.

Luna, 13^o die Februarii, 1837.

Ordered, THAT Mr. Strutt and M. Sandford be discharged from further attendance; and that Mr. French and Mr. Murgan John O'Connell be added to the said Committee.

Luna, 6^o die Martii, 1837.

Ordered, THAT Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer be discharged from further attendance; and that Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland be added to the said Committee.

Veneris, 12^o die Maii, 1837.

Ordered, THAT the Committee have power to report the Minutes of Evidence taken before them, from time to time, to The House.

THE REPORT	- - - - -	p. iii
MINUTES OF EVIDENCE	- - - - -	p. 1
APPENDIX	- - - - -	p. 479

R E P O R T.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE appointed to inquire how far the intentions of the Reform Bill are defeated by creating and registering Fictitious and Improper Votes in *Ireland*, and who were empowered to report the MINUTES OF EVIDENCE taken before them, from time to time, to The House ;—

HAVE examined several Witnesses, and have agreed to Report the EVIDENCE given by them to The House.

12 *May* 1837.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE COMMITTEE.

Martis, 14^o die Februarii, 1837.

PRESENT :

Lord Granville Somerset.
Mr. Emerson Tennent.
Mr. Lefroy.
Mr. Hogg.
Mr. Morgan John O'Connell.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Milnes Gaskell.

Sir Robert Ferguson.
Mr. Serjeant Jackson.
Mr. More O'Ferrall.
Mr. O'Connell.
Mr. Serjeant Ball.
Mr. French.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET called to the Chair.

Order of reference, read. Petitions referred, read. Several Returns ordered: and several Witnesses ordered to attend.

[Adjourned till Tuesday, 21st February.]

Martis, 21^o die Februarii, 1837.

PRESENT :

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, in the Chair.

Mr. More O'Ferrall.
Mr. Lefroy.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Morgan John O'Connell.
Mr. Hogg.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.
Mr. Emerson Tennent.
Mr. O'Connell.
Mr. French.

Several Witnesses were ordered to attend.

[Adjourned till Tuesday, 28 February.]

Martis, 28^o die Februarii, 1837.

Motion made, and Question put, "That the Chairman do move The House, that the Attorney-general for Ireland be substituted for the Chancellor of the Exchequer."—
(Mr. Morgan John O'Connell.)

Ayes.

Mr. O'Connell.
Sir Robert Ferguson.
Mr. Morgan John O'Connell.
Mr. Serjeant Ball.

Noes.

Mr. Lefroy.
Mr. Emerson Tennent.
Mr. Hogg.

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

LIST OF WITNESSES.

Martis, 28 ^a die Februarii, 1837:		Lunæ, 17 ^a die Aprilis, 1837:	
<i>John O'Dwyer, Esq.</i> - - - - p. 1		<i>Mr. Richard Legge</i> - - - - p. 216	
<i>Mr. John Gilmer</i> - - - - p. 13		<i>Mr. George Graham</i> - - - - p. 240	
Mercurii, 1 ^a die Martii, 1837:		Mercurii, 19 ^a die Aprilis, 1837:	
<i>John O'Dwyer, Esq.</i> - - - - p. 19		<i>Mr. George Graham</i> - - - - p. 244	
<i>Mr. John Gilmer</i> - - - - p. 21, 28		<i>Mr. Michael Glison</i> - - - - p. 265	
<i>Mr. Solomon Dorez</i> - - - - p. 28, 34		<i>Mr. Edward Labarte</i> - - - - p. 267	
Veneris, 3 ^a die Martii, 1837:		Lunæ, 24 ^a die Aprilis, 1837:	
<i>John O'Dwyer, Esq.</i> - - - - p. 35		<i>Mr. Edward Labarte</i> - - - - p. 276, 283	
<i>Mr. John Thompson</i> - - - - p. 37		<i>Mr. Michael Glison</i> - - - - p. 282	
<i>Mr. John Gibber</i> - - - - p. 42			
<i>William Mayne, Esq.</i> - - - - p. 42			
Mercurii, 8 ^a die Martii, 1837:		Jovis, 27 ^a die Aprilis, 1837:	
<i>Mr. John Bates</i> - - - - p. 47-54		<i>Mr. Edward Labarte</i> - - - - p. 303	
<i>Philip Fogarty, Esq.</i> - - - - p. 54		<i>Mr. Michael Glison</i> - - - - p. 315, 319	
		<i>Mr. Patrick J. Keily</i> - - - - p. 318	
Jovis, 9 ^a die Martii, 1837:		Lunæ, 1 ^a die Maii, 1837:	
<i>Mr. John Bates</i> - - - - p. 60		<i>Mr. Michael Glison</i> - - - - p. 325, 332	
		<i>Mr. Patrick J. Keily</i> - - - - p. 331	
		<i>Mr. Dennis Walsh</i> - - - - p. 344	
Lunæ, 13 ^a die Martii, 1837:		Jovis, 4 ^a die Maii, 1837:	
<i>Mr. John Bates</i> - - - - p. 85		<i>Mr. Dennis Walsh</i> - - - - p. 355, 359	
		<i>Mr. Patrick J. Keily</i> - - - - p. 359	
Jovis, 16 ^a die Martii, 1837:		Veneris, 5 ^a die Maii, 1837:	
<i>Mr. John Bates</i> - - - - p. 110		<i>Mr. Dennis Walsh</i> - - - - p. 389	
Lunæ, 20 ^a die Martii, 1837:		Lunæ, 8 ^a die Maii, 1837:	
<i>Mr. John Bates</i> - - - - p. 127		<i>Mr. Patrick J. Keily</i> , p. 421, 423, 435, 449	
		<i>Mr. Dennis Walsh</i> - p. 422, 431, 435	
Martis, 21 ^a die Martii, 1837:		Mercurii, 10 ^a die Maii, 1837:	
<i>James Whiteside, Esq.</i> - - - - p. 150		<i>Mr. Dennis Walsh</i> - - - - p. 455	
		<i>Mr. Patrick J. Keily</i> - - - - p. 470	
		<i>Mr. John Butler</i> - - - - p. 475	
Mercurii, 12 ^a die Aprilis, 1837:			
<i>Mr. Joseph Higgins</i> - - - - p. 168			
<i>Mr. William Smith</i> - - - - p. 186			
Veneris, 14 ^a die Aprilis, 1837:			
<i>Mr. William Smith</i> - - - - p. 192			

[1]

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE.

Martis, 28^o die Februarii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Sir Robert Ferguson.
Mr. M. Gaskell.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Hogg.
Mr. Sergeant Jackson.
Mr. Lefroy.

Mr. O'Connell.
Mr. M. J. O'Connell.
Mr. Moore O'Ferrall.
Lord Granville Somerset.
Mr. Emerson Tennent.
Mr. Sergeant Ball.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

John O'Dwyer, Esq. called in; and Examined.

1. *Chairman.*] YOU are a barrister-at-law?—I am.
2. Were you appointed under the 66th sec. of the 2 & 3 Will. 4; c. 28, as deputy assistant registering barrister?—I was.
3. Did you act as such?—I did in the year 1832.
4. For more than one sessions?—For one sessions; no more. It was one registry at Lisburn, and another in the borough of Belfast.
5. Have you ever acted as registering barrister since that period?—I have acted as assistant barrister since then, and have registered some county votes, but not many, while acting as deputy assistant barrister for a gentleman that was ill.
6. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] In 1832, when you were the deputy assistant barrister in Belfast, do you recollect what number of voters were registered?—1,642 voters registered.
7. Do you recollect what number were rejected?—I do; there were 3,375 claimants who had served notices.
8. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Do you mean notices or individuals?—I mean individuals who served notice of their intention to apply to be registered.
9. Were there no duplicate notices?—I am not aware; it is probable that there were; but I do not know that there were duplicate notices.
10. You do not mean to say that there were not?—Certainly not; I do not mean to say either one way or the other about it.
11. *Chairman.*] How many were admitted?—1,642 admitted: there were 189 that appeared, and were rejected. The numbers that I have stated to the Committee I have taken from a document that was shown to me: but the numbers were very familiar to me at the time, and, upon its being shown to me, my memory enables me to say that those numbers were accurate.
12. Who showed it to you?—Mr. Bates; but I am perfectly certain of the accuracy of the numbers.
13. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Do you know what proportion of those were rejected for want of value?—I do: there were 50 out of 189 rejected for deficiency of value.
14. Will you state to the Committee what you considered a sufficient compliance with the Act of Parliament as to the description of the person contained in the notice?—The objections that were raised to the notice were three. The first objection was founded upon a mistake in the name of the person claiming in his notice, or in the printed list, incorrect description of residence, or incorrect residence. Sometimes it was incorrect description of residence, and sometimes it was a total mistake, describing a man as residing where he did not reside at all.
15. With

John O'Dwyer, Esq.

23 February 1837.

15. With regard to residence, did you require a specification of the street in which the person resided?—I did. It may be right that I should state to the Committee why I did so: I conceived that the object of the notice was to enable a person who might raise objections to any person seeking the franchise to come forward and substantiate those objections. Some of those objections might arise, and did arise, from personal disability, and therefore, in a town like Belfast, where there were many persons of the same name, I considered that it was not giving the public the notice that they were entitled to, if the true residence of the person was not given, and which, I conceived, was required by my reading of the Act: I considered that the meaning of "residence" was the place of dwelling.

16. What was the third objection?—The third objection to the notice was an incorrect description of the premises out of which they sought to be entitled to register. Perhaps I may illustrate that objection in this way: in some instances, it turned out that a person had served notice of a house; afterwards, in point of fact, it turned out that he was only the tenant or owner of a shop, or part of the house; and therefore I conceived that a person who might see that the whole house was worth 10*l.*, might not come forward to make an objection, as he might have done if the notice had been properly framed as a notice to vote out of the shop; but he would abstain from objecting under the notion that the person was entitled to the whole house. I give that as an illustration of the meaning of an incorrect description.

17. With regard to the qualification set forth by the claimant, what proof did you require in Belfast to substantiate it?—First, the oath of the claimant himself to the value; second, I took into consideration the rent paid by the claimant; and third, the police valuation of the house. With reference to the police valuation, it may be necessary to state, that the houses in the town of Belfast are valued with a view to impose a police tax: that formed an ingredient in estimating the value. The fourth was the evidence of valuers. The parties on each side were very much alive at the first registry in Belfast, and each side had one or two valuers, who were employed to inspect the houses, and give evidence as to the value. They certainly gave great assistance to the revising barrister.

18. *Chairman.*] Would you call them party valuers?—They were employed by the two contending parties.

19. *Mr. O'Connell.*] There was an attorney and a counsel on each side?—There were two counsel and an attorney on each side; at least, the greater part of the time there was.

20. And the cases were litigated before you with a great deal of attention and anxiety?—Certainly; they were litigated with a great deal of candour. Mr. M'Donnell, who was concerned on one side, and Mr. Whiteside on the other, manifested a great deal of candour.

21. Did they not manifest zeal for their clients?—Proper zeal unquestionably; but nothing improper.

22. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Independently of these classes of evidence which you have alluded to, did you adopt any other expedient?—Yes; in some cases I examined the premises myself, where there was conflicting testimony, and I could not make up my mind upon it. In doing so, I ascertained a house in the neighbourhood conceded by both parties to be of the value of 10*l.*, so as to enable me to compare the house in dispute with the house conceded by both parties to be of the full value.

23. When the rent happened to be under 10*l.*, and the police valuation was under 8*l.*, did you make it a rule to omit that vote?—As a general rule, I excluded in those cases.

24. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Are the Committee to understand that the police valuation is not an absolute valuation as to the worth of the house; but is in that proportion that a police valuation of 8*l.* would be a *bona fide* valuation of 10*l.* a year?—I do not think it would; but I thought a house valued so low as 8*l.* by the police was so much below 10*l.* that it made it a clear case for exclusion; but I do not say that the valuation by the police did not approach nearer to the full value. I think it was *quasi proxima*, though not quite to the full value of the house.

25. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Are you aware of the grounds upon which the police valuation was made; whether it was a relative or an absolute valuation?—Their primary object was merely relative; therefore they did not go to the very extreme of the value.

26. *Mr.*

26. Mr. O'Connell.] You did not consider yourself concluded by the police valuation?—No, certainly not. I stated that that was the general rule which I acted upon. I intend to state to the Committee the principle upon which I made exceptions from this. John O'Draper, Esq.
28 February 1837.

27. Chairman.] Will you state what those exceptions were?—I admitted the party to register, though his rent was under 10*l.*, where a fine had been paid, where any subsequent improvements had been made, where it was an old take under a lease, and the value of the houses in that neighbourhood had increased. There might probably have been other cases that do not occur to me, but these are fresh in my memory. Then, in the excepted cases, there were some few, I believe very few, where I did admit persons to register where the police valuation was below 8*l.*; and that was principally where there had been large buildings behind the house that did not appear at the front, and two houses might apparently present the same front to the valuator; perhaps they went into one room, but upon further inspection or further evidence, there were additional buildings. That made one house, though apparently of the same value as another, rated by the police incorrectly; and where a case of that kind was proved, I admitted it, though it was below 8*l.* in the police valuation.

28. Can you state what was the lowest police valuation you admitted to the right of voting?—No, I cannot; nor the lowest rent. I may say this: I certainly endeavoured, as far as in me lay, to ascertain what was the true value; because, while on the one hand I did not wish to deprive any man in the town of the right of franchise who was entitled to it, I was not less anxious not to give it to persons that I conceived were not legally entitled to it.

29. Mr. E. Tennent.] With regard to taxes, in what light did you regard them as matter of evidence?—It never was pressed by the counsel on either side to take any taxes into consideration at all, as forming part of the value of the house. That point was not raised in any way.

30. Chairman.] Will you explain what you mean by taxes?—The local taxes of the town, the police tax; it is one tax for all the purposes of the town; in fact, a town rate. I think it right to mention one case in which, although the rent was 10*l.*, or perhaps a few shillings more, I did not consider that that was conclusive evidence of the value. That was in the case of weekly tenants. I do not know whether I may have acted erroneously or not, but I did act so: I considered that in the case of a rent got in that way a person was able to get above the ordinary value of a house let in the other way.

31. Mr. O'Connell.] In that case you rejected it?—No, I did not reject it; but I did not hold the rent as satisfactory evidence of the value. I rejected some, but in many instances they were able to give me other evidence; but I did not take the rent of 10*l.* as evidence *per se* in the case of weekly tenants.

32. But there were cases in which, although the rent was more than 10*l.* a year, you rejected them?—A few shillings more in the case of weekly payments.

33. Mr. E. Tennent.] Had you evidence in such cases that the house was not worth 10*l.* a year?—Decidedly; I had contrary evidence upon that, that it was not.

34. Mr. O'Connell.] Though the rent was paid for it, you rejected the tenant upon evidence of estimated value?—Yes; upon evidence.

35. Mr. Hamilton.] Had you proof of the payment of rent, or only of an agreement for rent in those cases?—I think I had in most cases proof of the fact of the payment of the rent; but I cannot state positively. I take for granted that it was paid, or else the tenants would not be continued.

36. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] In those cases where the value was attempted to be established by the payment of rent, payable weekly, was the evidence followed out before you, so as to show a continuous weekly payment for the whole year?—It must have been proved for six months, because the party must have been a tenant for six months. I cannot take upon me to say whether they established the payment for 12 months consecutively or not.

37. Did they in those cases ever establish it for six months by the individual lodgers?—Decidedly, or else they could not have had any claim. I considered that persons paid above the value who took places as weekly tenants. The landlord was subject to have those tenements vacant very frequently from changes, the person being bound only for a week, and therefore he calculates that the tenant that occupies must of course pay for the time that the house would be idle,

John O'Dwyer, Esq.
28 February 1837.

and in that way he charges a higher rate, and the persons paid more than it was really worth for the accommodation of not being bound beyond the week.

38. Then you did not suffer yourself to be determined by the amount of weekly payment, but you heard other evidence either to support that view of the value or to contradict that view of the value?—Certainly; where the evidence preponderated against it, I decided against it, although they did pay above 10*l.*, and where the evidence was favourable I admitted them of course.

39. Mr. *E. Teament*.] With respect to lodgers, what course did you take?—The point was never raised, I believe, anywhere upon the first registry, certainly not before me.

40. Mr. *O'Connell*.] You had read the Act yourself attentively in order to perform your duty?—Certainly; I do not think I could have omitted such an obvious point of my duty. I certainly read it, whether well or ill I do not know.

41. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson*.] And very often, no doubt?—And very often; and heard it read very often to me.

42. Mr. *E. Teament*.] With regard to the six months of actual occupation which is required by the Reform Act, what did you consider a sufficient compliance with that requisition?—There were some cases before me in which a party had been building a house and claimed to register out of the house; but it not appearing to me that it had been a house habitable, I conceived, in the case of a new house, that it was only from the time that it was inhabited that the six months began to run. I did not consider that a man was in the actual occupation of it when the builders and carpenters were in possession of it.

43. That is an observation that applies only to a dwelling-house?—Yes: with regard to warehouses I did not conceive that the mere possession of a warehouse, locked up and not made use of as a warehouse for the purposes of trade, for six months, was such an occupation as the Act contemplated.

44. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Did you reject votes upon that account?—I rather think I did reject votes where it appeared that the warehouse had not been used as a warehouse for six months. I conceive that the franchise was given to warehouses in favour of trade, and that it was by reason of its being used as a warehouse that the franchise was bestowed; and I did not consider that that was an occupation of a warehouse, keeping it locked up.

45. Is there a single word expressed in the statute to favour your construction?—I conceive that requiring that the person is to hold and occupy does favour my construction?—The harrister must put a construction upon the word "occupy;" and where the party swears that he is in the actual occupation, the words "actual occupation" must have some meaning, and that is the conclusion I drew; but I do not appear here to defend or to argue my decisions. I come here in obedience to the orders of this Committee to state what I did.

46. Then there is no other word, according to your recollection, in the statute except the word occupation, to favour the construction which you put upon it?—The word "occupy" in the section of the Act, and the words "actual occupation" in the oath.

47. Nothing else?—Not that I recollect at this moment.

48. And upon that construction you have rejected votes?—I think I did reject some votes upon that; I am not positive, but I think I did.

49. Mr. *Lefroy*.] Was it merely upon the ground that for the last six months there had been no occupation, or was it upon the ground that there was no evidence at any time of any actual occupation? For instance, in a case where there was evidence of actual occupation by the use of the place as a warehouse, did you reject the vote merely because the last six months the tenant did not appear to have used it as a warehouse?—No.

50. But it was in cases where there was no evidence of having ever used it as a warehouse *de facto*?—The cases, so far as my memory serves me, were those where a man took a warehouse for the purpose, and with the intention of trading, but in point of fact he never had carried that intention into effect, but though he had the legal possession of it, he had never begun to use it.

51. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Do you mean to say that you inquired into any occupation prior to the six months?—Yes I did, to assist me in determining the character of the building itself.

52. Then you inquired into the particular mode of user of the premises, although

no other person had title or possession except the claimant to vote?—I did, with a view to ascertain the nature of the premises.

53. *Chairman.*] Does not it appear by the 7th clause that a person shall "hold and occupy" such and such a house, and then in the schedule there are the words "in possession and actual occupation?"—Yes, those are the words I refer to.

54. Then construing the section with the schedule, you came to the determination you have stated to the Committee?—Yes.

55. *Mr. O'Connell.*] In fact, you rejected them for not trading?—No, I did not say that.

56. Would you have admitted the vote if there had been evidence that the person had traded in the warehouses?—Most undoubtedly.

57. Then it was for not trading?—I do not say that.

58. *Mr. Hamilton.*] The use of the warehouse appears to have been your criterion of the occupation?—Yes.

59. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] With regard to clerks who are resident on the establishments and concerns of their masters, or warehousemen who receive their houses as a portion of their salaries, what course did you pursue? Do you conceive that a sufficient possession and occupancy?—I conceived that such persons were not tenants under the Reform Act, and not entitled to register where they held houses rent free as a part of their salary.

60. *Chairman.*] Supposing they occupied houses under that tenure, but still paid the rates and taxes accruing upon those houses, what was your interpretation then?—I am not aware that such an instance arose at all. The masters paid the rates and taxes.

61. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Then in the case in which the occupier occupied the house as part of his salary and reward for being a clerk, you rejected such a person, not considering him a tenant?—I did.

62. *Mr. Lefroy.*] In those cases the master paid the rates?—The master paid the rates of the dwelling-house.

63. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Did you reject any man paying rent in money, upon the ground of somebody else paying the rates?—No, I never heard the objection urged.

64. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Did the question arise?—No, I never heard anything said upon the subject at all.

65. *Mr. O'Connell.*] It was no part of your inquiry?—I do not recollect anything said about it.

66. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] If the question had been raised, you would have decided it to the best of your judgment?—Yes.

67. *Mr. O'Connell.*] How would you have decided it?—I shall not answer that, because I would have had the benefit of hearing it argued, and then I should have given the best determination I could upon it.

68. Then you are not prepared at present to say how you would have decided that question?—I do not think I am called upon to answer that; I am unwilling to say anything about it.

69. Did not you reject tenants who paid by weekly sums a rent higher than 10*l.* a year?—I did weekly tenants who paid a few shillings more.

70. Did you take into your consideration, in so rejecting them, the fact that the rates were paid by somebody else?—I do not recollect that the fact ever appeared in evidence; it may have appeared, but I do not recollect it.

71. In what case did the fact of rates being paid by anybody else influence your judgment?—In the case of persons that I considered servants, shopmen and warehousemen, and persons in a distillery.

72. In that case the payment of rates by another was an ingredient in your judgment to reject the vote?—Probably it formed some ingredient; the principle I formed it upon was that he was not a tenant; that he could have been turned out of the house without a notice to quit, and that he did not hold and occupy within the meaning of the section.

73. Could not a tenant for two years be turned out without notice to quit?—He would be a tenant still; but I considered those persons as nothing but servants.

74. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Are you aware of any instance in which a person so occupying paid rent at all?—No.

75. *Mr. O'Connell.*] In the case you speak of was the payment of the rates by another person an ingredient in your judgment?—I said before that such a case never arose; it never appeared in evidence at all.

John O'Dwyer, Esq.
18 February 1837.

76. Did the payment of rates by another person form any ingredient in your decision for rejecting persons who occupied as clerks, or as being employed by a master or a merchant?—I take for granted that it was one of the circumstances of the case. Of course, a man would consider everything in the circumstances of the case. I do not recollect that it made any particular impression on me.

77. Can you state whether it did or did not form an ingredient in your judgment?—I cannot.

78. Even in that case?—I cannot. I presume that I considered it with all the other circumstances; but I cannot state that it more than any other circumstance weighed with me.

79. Does your memory supply you with the fact whether or not, in the case of those servants, the payment of rates by another person than the claimant, formed any ingredient in your decision or not?—My memory does not allow me to say more than this, that every circumstance in the case formed an ingredient in the decision I made, of course.

80. Does your memory enable you to say that that was one of the circumstances?—I presume it was; I cannot say one way or the other about it?

81. Stating it as a fact and not presumption, can you state distinctly from memory, either one way or the other, whether it did or not?—I cannot state positively whether it did; all I can say is that I suppose it did.

82. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Have you a recollection whether in point of fact in the instance of that class of voters, namely, those who occupied premises as clerks or servants, whether in any of those cases, without fixing on any individual case, the circumstance of the rates being paid by another than the person proposed to be registered, appeared in evidence before you?—It never appeared in evidence before me, as far as I can recollect, that a servant or a clerk occupying paid the rates himself.

83. Have you a recollection generally of the fact, without fixing upon any individual case, that in that class of cases where the person was a clerk or servant, the circumstance appeared in evidence that the rates were not paid by the individual proposing to be registered, but paid by the master?—I am sure it did appear in evidence.

84. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you mean that you have a recollection of it?—Yes, I have a recollection that the fact was proved of the payment of the rates by the employer or the owner of the house.

85. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Then are the Committee to understand that what you mean to say is this, that you have no particular recollection of any individual case as to whether that circumstance weighed in the judgment you formed or not, but that you have a general recollection that such a circumstance did appear in some of the cases before you, which you took into consideration with the other circumstances of the case?—To be sure it did. No doubt.

86. Mr. O'Connell.] Then, recollecting that in the class of cases in which servants were in occupation, it was proved, and was one of the ingredients of your decision, that the rates were paid by somebody else, will you state whether there was any such evidence given in any case except in the case of servants in possession?—I have no recollection of it being given in any other case.

87. Is your recollection that it was not clear?—My belief is that it did not occur; I have no recollection of it having occurred.

88. Are you prepared to state at present whether you would consider it an ingredient of rejection in a case where a yearly rent of 10 *l.* was paid or upwards, if it appeared in evidence that the rate was paid by somebody else?

The question was objected to.

The Witness was directed to withdraw.

It was moved and seconded that the question be put to the Witness, which was carried in the affirmative.

Ayes.
Mr. O'Connell.
Mr. J. M. O'Connell.
Sir Robert Ferguson.
Mr. More O'Ferrall.
Mr. Milnes Gaskell.
Mr. Hogg.

Noes.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Serjeant Jackson.
Mr. Lefroy.
Mr. Emerson Tennent.

The Witness was again called in, and the question read.

John O'Dwyer, Esq.

I should think it would not be a reason for rejecting the vote, that the rate was paid by somebody else. 25 February 1837.

89. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] With regard to this class of voters and persons, who are occupying the premises under others, receiving it as a portion of their salaries for their services, do you remember in any cases having admitted any such?—Not of that class: I have admitted schoolmasters upon some authorities cited to me in some cases in which it was held that schoolmasters who held under trustees for the benefit of a school, who had a house and a salary, stood in a different situation from servants. There were two cases cited, in which it was held that they could not be turned out in the same way that a servant could, and I admitted them in consequence.

90. *Mr. Hogg.*] You state that you did not admit a clerk, or an occupier of premises exceeding in value, where the occupation went in part of wages or salary; did you in that case consider the occupation by the clerk or servant such an occupation as would entitle the master to vote, the master having no other vote?—I do not recollect the master in any of those cases having claimed.

91. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] Are you prepared to state how you would have decided that question, if it had arisen?—Yes, I am.

92. *Mr. Hogg.*] Would you have considered it such an actual occupation by the master, through his servant, as would have entitled him to vote for a tenement in his possession amounting to 10 l. or upwards?—I would certainly; I would have considered that he was occupying still by his servant, and that it was his occupation, and not the servant's.

93. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] In the case of partnerships, did you admit joint occupants of houses to register?—No. At the first registry under the Reform Bill, most of the barristers admitted joint tenants and joint occupiers to vote; some did not, and I was one of them; and I understood afterwards, that upon an appeal to the Judges, the Judges ruled that joint occupants were not entitled to vote. There is a clause in the English Act which gives them a right to vote, provided the occupation is such as to give 10 l. to each. That clause is omitted in the Irish Act; and I understood that to make a difference in the law, and the Judges have so decided it.

94. *Mr. O'Connell.*] You have stated with sufficient accuracy the number rejected for under value; can you state how many persons who had been returned in the police-rate as at a less value than 10 l. a year, you admitted to register?—No, I cannot.

95. Can you form any estimate of it at all?—No, I cannot.

96. Was there anything upon that subject in the paper that Mr. Bates showed you?—No.

97. What was the paper that Mr. Bates showed you?—I cannot say; it had those figures, and my own memory served me to know, from seeing them, that they were correct.

98. Had it nothing but those figures?—It had a great deal more; but I did not read anything more than those figures, which I took down.

99. Where was it that Mr. Bates showed you that paper?—In a room in town.

100. What was the occasion upon which he produced that paper to you?—I asked him whether he had any means of ascertaining the numbers, as I was not perfectly certain of the numbers, and I wished to know them; and he pulled out a paper that had columns, containing the figures of the different registers; and the first column at the top of it was these figures.

101. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] Is Mr. Bates a professional man?—He is.

102. Did he show you that as a part of the registry at Belfast?—Yes, he did.

103. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Is he not the attorney for the anti-reform interest?—I believe he did not act as an attorney at that registry.

104. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] Did you apply to him because you knew that he was a man well-informed upon the subject?—Yes.

105. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Your recollection is that he was not an attorney upon the first registry?—Yes.

106. Did he state to you where he had got those figures?—I believe he did; but I do not recollect.

107. Was not it to-day that you saw him?—It was; but I did not pay particular attention

John O'Dwyer, Esq.

28 February 1877.

attention to that. I just took down the figures. Mr. Bates is here, and I suppose he can produce the paper.

108. Are you prepared to say that you did not register 40 persons, the value of whose houses was returned under 10 *l.* a year in the police valuation?—No, I am not; but in those cases in which the rates were below 8 *l.* I always had other special circumstances to justify me, as I conceived, for departing from the general rule that I had previously laid down.

109. Are you prepared to say that you did not register a voter upon the conservative interest who was opposed by the reform interest, and whose house was not valued at all in the police rate?—My memory does not serve me to say whether I did or not.

110. Are you aware that the lowest value set in the police rate is 5 *l.* a year?—I believe it is.

111. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Are you aware that the boundaries of the borough for parliamentary purposes exceed the boundaries of the borough for municipal purposes? Are there not persons of large property not rated in the police books, who are nevertheless registered for the borough?—I am not aware.

112. *Mr. O'Connell.*] The former question related to a person that was not rated, but who was within the limit to which the rate extended?—I presumed that the question implied that; but my memory does not serve me to say whether it was so or not.

113. *Chairman.*] This notice was served upon you whilst you were resident in England?—It was.

114. You have not your own papers and documents with you?—I have not; I have no papers of my own.

115. *Mr. Sergeant Jackson.*] You were in England when you were summoned to attend here?—Yes, I was at Clifton.

116. If you had been summoned in Ireland, you would have brought your papers over with you?—I would have brought over what papers I have. It is five years ago now.

117. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Do you mean to state that you have documents in Ireland that would elucidate this subject?—I did certainly take notes; but whether I have the documents at present, I cannot say. I would have searched, and I would have brought anything I had.

118. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] You stated in the commencement of your examination that 189 persons had been rejected by you for want of value and other causes; how many of those were subsequently placed on the register in consequence of appeals to the Judges from your decision?—There was no appeal to any of the Judges from any of my decisions.

119. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Was there any other registering barrister in Belfast in 1852 except yourself?—No; I was the only registering barrister for the town at the first sessions.

120. The lodgers' point had not been raised then?—No, I believe not in any part of Ireland at that time; it certainly was not raised before me.

121. You were assessor at the election in Belfast?—I was, at two elections.

122. By whom were you appointed?—I was appointed by the returning officer.

123. What is his name?—Sir Stephen May was the first returning officer, and Mr. Agnew was at the last election.

124. Which was the first election you was assessor to?—At the first election immediately after the registry I was appointed by Sir Stephen May; but it was understood that it was at the joint suggestion of the agents on both sides, that they were very well satisfied with my decisions and impartiality; and to show that they were so, it was their wish that I should be brought to the election.

125. At the second election you were appointed by somebody else?—By Mr. Agnew.

126. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] With the consent of both parties?—I cannot speak to my own knowledge about that; I believe it was the case, but I do not know it of my own knowledge.

127. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Upon the second occasion did you not advise the returning officer to reject, and did not he reject lodgers who had been registered before you?—Not at all; there was nothing of that kind before me.

128. Did not the lodgers' point arise upon any occasion when you were assessor?—No.

129. Did any question arise upon the rejection of voters who had certificates?—There did objections arise. John O'Dwyer, Esq.
28 February 1837.
130. Did any question arise upon voters registered before you?—There did.
131. Did you recommend the rejection of any voters who had certificates which had been obtained before you?—I did, one.
132. What was the ground of the rejection?—That the certificate was informal; that it did not state the qualification under the Reform Act upon the face of it.
133. Did that man appear upon the roll of the registry?—I presume he did; he had a certificate; that was all I had to look to.
134. If the certificate was defective, was not he entitled to vote from the roll?—From the affidavits, if they were correct, he was undoubtedly.
135. Was his affidavit equally defective?—Yes; the certificate had followed the affidavit, which had been drawn up by the party himself.
136. Then you did not, at either of those elections, direct the returning officer to reject upon the lodger point?—No, certainly not.
137. Mr. Morgan O'Connell.] What was the point upon which you did reject?—The certificate stated that the person was entitled to registry out of a house and shop. The seventh section of the Reform Act gives the franchise to any person who shall hold or occupy any house or warehouse, counting-house or shop; and it also gives the power of adding to a house or any of the others land in the particular cases where the land is held under the same landlord. I conceived that it appeared upon the face of the certificate as if the two qualifications were united; and as I did not conceive the section in the Reform Act authorized the union of any two except a house or any of the others and land held under the same landlord, I considered that it stated upon the face of the certificate as a qualification that which was not a qualification.
138. Mr. O'Connell.] But it was you yourself who had given that certificate?—Yes.
139. And there were several voters registered before you upon a similar affidavit, and got a similar certificate?—I was told so.
140. Can you give the Committee any estimate of the number of certificates which you granted of the same nature with that of the individual rejected by you, as assessor?—No, I cannot.
141. There were several, however?—I heard it alleged that there were several, but I do not know that it was the case.
142. Could you state that there were not 50?—No, I could not.
143. Could you state that there were not 100?—No, I could not.
144. Then there might have been for what you recollect?—I have no recollection upon the subject.
145. Chairman.] What election are you speaking of?—The election in the summer or the autumn of 1835.
146. Mr. O'Connell.] Who were the candidates?—Mr. Dunbar was one, and Mr. Robert James Tennent was the other.
147. It was not a general election?—No; it was not. It was upon the death of Mr. McCance.
148. Chairman.] Was there any election petition on that occasion?—No.
149. Mr. O'Connell.] The person you rejected was a person of the name of Clare?—I do not recollect the name, but I believe it was.
150. You do not mean to set your memory in opposition to the allegation that there were 100 votes depending upon that decision?—I should be very incredulous upon the subject. Unless the person said he had some means of knowing it, I would not believe it to be the fact.
151. Would you be surprised if there were 80?—I would not be surprised either one way or the other.
152. The point was raised at the first election at which you attended as assessor?—I heard that stated, but I do not believe it. I have no recollection of it; and my impression and my firm belief is, that it did not arise at the first election.
153. Then, as far as your recollection goes, you do not believe it arose at the first election?—As far as my recollection goes, I do not.
154. Mr. Lefroy.] The certificates are prepared by the agent or attorney of the party?—In most cases the certificates were prepared by the agents of the different sides, according as the voters came up; but in some few instances the certificates were prepared by the clerk of the peace from the affidavit that the voter brought up; he followed the affidavit.

John O'Dwyer, Esq.
28 February 1837.

155. *Mr. O'Connell.*] The affidavit was sworn before you?—It was. I do not want at all to shift the blame of it, if I acted wrong.
156. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Was the objection urged at the registration?—It never was.
157. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Have you any recollection of yourself being in any instance the person to prepare the certificate?—Never.
158. The certificate was merely handed to you for signature?—It was, and I signed it. In that particular instance it is fair to say, that it was not prepared by the agents on either side. The affidavit was prepared by the party himself, and the clerk of the peace followed the affidavit in the certificate.
159. Who was the clerk of the peace?—*Mr. Kennedy Jackson* was acting as clerk of the peace.
160. *Mr. Lefroy.*] But the point was not made before you as registering barrister?—Certainly not.
161. You came to no decision upon it?—No; I never made any decision upon it. The Committee will permit me to say, that the question upon which I came to this decision was argued by *Mr. Gilmore* on one side, and *Mr. M'Donnell* on the other, and I gave the question every consideration that I was capable of giving it; and when I was told that it was of importance to the election, I told *Mr. M'Donnell* that I would have the case re-argued the next day, with a view of giving it further consideration; and I conceived that that had been agreed upon.
162. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Are you aware whether the voters who were disqualified were all of one party in politics, or whether they were equally on both sides?—I have no means of knowing anything about it; and I can say, that, as far as I could, I never let the question of whom they were brought up by, or who took their part, influence me in the slightest degree. I can most solemnly say that to the Committee.
163. You are not aware that voters on both sides were equally affected by the decision?—I am not aware how it cuts at all; I never allowed that to enter into my consideration in the remotest degree.
164. *Mr. O'Connell.*] You are aware that after that decision the contest ended?—After *Mr. M'Donnell* had been with me, and I had agreed to have the point re-argued the next day, in the middle of the night an advertisement was published, giving up the contest.
165. You had decided it in the evening?—I had decided it in the evening.
166. You had arranged for a re-argument the next morning?—Yes, and after that arrangement this advertisement was prepared, and published during the night.
167. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Were you ever informed of any punishment inflicted upon you for your conduct upon that occasion?—I have since been removed from the situation which I held of counsel of the Crown on the circuit; and I have heard it stated that it was in consequence of that decision, which was displeasing to the Government.
168. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Were you a supernumerary counsel?—I was not a supernumerary counsel.
169. How many counsel were there upon that circuit?—There were four regular counsel and two supernumeraries.
170. *Chairman.*] How many are there now?—The same number: *Mr. Smith* and I were both removed.
171. Who were named in your place?—*Mr. Sauce* and *Mr. Dixon*.
172. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Who were the two leading counsel?—*Mr. Scott* and *Mr. Smith* were the two leading counsel.
173. Who was the *Mr. Smith* that was removed?—*Mr. Smith*, who was one of the leading counsel of the Crown upon the circuit.
174. Which of the former counsel were retained?—*Mr. Scott* and *Mr. Plunkett*, the son of the Lord Chancellor; he was one of the four counsel that were retained. I beg to say that I do not mention in any way of complaint his being preferred before me; his appointment was prior to mine, and in every point of view he was entitled to preference.
175. Are not *Mr. Scott's* political opinions at least as strong as your own, and of the same nature?—I believe they are of the same nature.
176. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] Were not your politics in Ireland, what are called, in reference to the Roman Catholic Question, liberal? Were not you an advocate for emancipation?—I was.
177. Was not *Mr. Scott* of the same political opinions?—Yes.

178. Is not Mr. Dixon, who is nominated your successor, a member of the National Association?—He is.

179. Who is Mr. Sauce?—He is a Roman Catholic barrister on my circuit, who had been assisting Mr. O'Loughlin, who was then the Attorney-general, in his office.

180. Do you know whether he is a member of the Association?—I do not.

181. Mr. Morgan O'Connell.] Was not Mr. Sauce one of the Commissioners of Corporate Inquiry in Ireland?—I believe he was.

182. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you mean to say that Mr. Scott continued to support Emancipation?—He did so; I always considered Mr. Scott as an advocate for Emancipation. There is not a more honourable or more upright and conscientious man at the Irish bar.

183. Mr. Levey.] The discussion which you say took place upon the subject of the certificate was not a discussion before you as registering barrister, but a discussion before you as assessor?—As assessor to the returning officer in my private capacity at the election.

184. But the point with respect to the qualification was never discussed before you at the registry?—Certainly not.

185. And therefore you never decided it?—I never decided it.

186. Mr. O'Connell.] You took upon you to reject the voters though they had a certificate signed by you?—I did; it was Mr. Gilmore who argued the point, who is certainly one of the first lawyers at our bar. It convinced me that the certificate was wrong. I felt that it would be a very culpable thing upon my part, if I were not to give the best decision I could form upon the question, merely because mine had been the hand that signed the previous certificate; and I was perfectly willing, and I am still, to share whatever blame results from having signed the certificate. I think it better to bear that than to make a decision, or to advise the returning officer against what my conscience told me was the decision that ought to be made.

187. In signing the certificate you acted purely ministerially?—Partly.

188. You had never read it, nor were you aware that any point arose upon it?—Not at all; but I do not mean to say that I was altogether blameless in it.

189. Mr. O'Connell.] Your meaning is, that, as the assistant barrister, you decided in favour of the vote, your attention not having been particularly called to the point, and no argument having been adduced to you against it?—Yes.

190. Do you mean to say that you decided it?—No, I did not decide it; the man gave me the certificate.

191. Was not that a decision? Did not you admit the vote?—I admitted the vote upon that affidavit, my attention not having been called to the point.

192. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] But suppose that it had even been regularly raised before you, and that you had decided it upon argument, and you were afterwards satisfied that you had erred in judgment, would not you feel it your duty to advise the returning officer rightly, according to your view at the time?—Most decidedly, at any cost to myself.

193. Although the other had been your own decision?—The more so because it was my own decision.

194. Mr. O'Connell.] And you leave it to the Committee of the House of Commons to decide which of your opinions was the right one?—It was open to the parties to come before a Committee if they thought right.

195. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Were you in expectation that that question would be raised before you upon the subsequent day of the election?—In the evening of that day, after the Court was up, I settled with Mr. M'Donnell, when he told me that there were some more votes depending upon it, to have it re-argued, and I considered it an open question.

196. Were you surprised to hear of the determination to give up the election?—I was never more surprised in my life. I considered it a great breach of faith; not upon Mr. M'Donnell's part, for it was done without his being aware of it; and I am certain, if he had been aware of it, he never would have sanctioned it, after the conversation took place. He is an honourable man.

197. Mr. Hogg.] It is the duty of the clerk of the peace to prepare the certificate?—Yes.

198. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] That is to say, if the party does not bring his certificate already drawn?—Yes; and he did fill up a great many for persons.

John O'Dwyer, Esq.

199. Mr. O'Connell.] There are printed forms, are there not?—Yes, there are; they got the certificates quicker by having them prepared themselves.

28 February 1837.

200. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Have you ever been restored to your situation of prosecuting counsel on the circuit?—I have not.

201. Has Mr. Smith ever been restored?—No, he has not.

202. Mr. E. Tennent.] Upon a general survey of this Act of Parliament, what is your impression as to a defect in it, which admits of the creation of fictitious voters?—I think there is nothing more favourable to the creation of fictitious voters than the absence of an appeal in case of improper admissions; it gives such a tedious and expensive mode of rectifying any mistake upon the part of any registering barrister, that I conceive it is favourable to that.

203. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] There is no annual revision of the registries, as there is in England?—No; it lasts for eight years.

204. Mr. O'Connell.] Your opinion is, that it would be better to have an appeal both ways?—Decidedly. I am sure it is the opinion of every assistant barrister in Ireland.

205. *Chairman.*] There is an appeal now in favour of a rejected voter, but not as against an improper admission?—Yes. A barrister who wants to gain popularity, or to save himself from any unpleasantness, has nothing to do but to admit all doubtful cases at least, because the chances are that it never will be set right.

206. Mr. O'Connell.] Did you ever consider whether the qualification ought to be diminished?—I consider it quite low enough as it is. I conceive it tends to give a preponderance to an inferior class of persons over persons of more property and education in the towns, more than they ought to have; but I think, strictly administered, I should not quarrel with it.

207. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you think there is a sufficient provision in the Act for the purpose of ascertaining value?—I think, if it were possible to devise some fixed standard, or if it were settled that it should be the *bonâ fide* payment of 10 *l.* a year rent, then there could be no discussion, and no fabrication of evidence. It would be exceedingly desirable if some fixed standard could be invariably applied; but I am not aware that it is possible to do it.

208. Mr. O'Connell.] A purchaser of a house, a person who paid no rent, would be excluded?—No, he pays it in the shape of interest of money.

209. The man that builds a house?—He pays for it in his expense of building. I do not say that the rent could be adopted as a fixed standard.

210. But your opinion is strong against lessening the qualification in Ireland?—It is, certainly; that is my honest conviction.

211. Would not the value of the appeal both ways depend very much upon the tribunal to which the appeal was made?—I suppose that the appeal would be made to the same tribunal in each case.

212. Mr. Lefroy.] The appeal that is given now upon the point of value is to a trial by jury?—It is.

213. But, in the first instance, the assistant barrister has no power to summon a jury, but he must decide upon his own judgment?—Yes.

214. Mr. O'Connell.] He must upon the evidence admit or reject, acting judicially and upon his oath?—Yes.

215. You were sworn, of course?—Of course; but I should have endeavoured to have done my duty whether I was sworn or not.

216. Mr. Hogg.] If there was a poor-rate would you consider a reference to that rate a judicious mode of fixing the qualification?—Probably it might be; but I am not conversant enough with the subject of poor-rates to form an opinion upon it.

217. Mr. O'Connell.] Is it possible that the board of guardians that would fix the poor-rates in Ireland might have a political leaning?—I do not know who the board of guardians would be or anything about them.

218. Mr. Hamilton.] Your opinion is very strong that if a fixed standard could be devised it would be desirable?—It is; and I conceive it is unfortunate for the administration of justice that that duty should have been imposed upon the assistant barrister.

219. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Your opinion is, that it would be desirable to separate the factions of the registering barrister from those of the assistant barrister at quarter sessions?—It is desirable, because, no matter what Government is in, people may make insinuations as if persons were selected for some view of the

the

the kind, whether rightly or wrongly; and if people get such ideas into their heads, it disparages their usefulness as assistant-barristers, and, to a certain extent, affects the respect paid to the general administration of justice at the quarter-sessions.

220. Mr. O'Connell.] Is it not really the case that the assistant barrister's office is disparaged by the connection?—I think it is.

221. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] How far back do you carry the date of the commencement of this disparagement?—I do not think I ought to answer that question.

Mr. John Gilmer, called in; and Examined.

222*. Chairman.] WHAT are you?—Clerk to the Commissioners of Police and the Police Committee of Belfast.

222. How long have you been in that situation.—I have been Clerk to the Committee of Police, I believe, 10 or 11 years, and upwards of two years to both Boards.

223. What are your duties as belonging to that situation?—My duties are to keep the minutes of the meetings of the Commissioners of Police, to give directions about the applotment book of the town, and all matters connected with the police, in the absence of the Boards.

224. Are you acquainted with the orders given for the valuation upon which the rates are levied?—I am.

225. Can you state upon what principles that valuation is made?—I can. The police affairs of Belfast are under the management of two Boards, the Commissioners of Police and the Police Committee, who are appointed by the Act to aid and assist in the execution of it: it is for Paving, Cleansing, Lighting and Improving the Town of Belfast.

226. Are those separate bodies, or is the Committee a small portion of a larger body?—They are separate bodies. The Commissioners are elected from those inhabitants who have paid 4*l.* of police taxes for the preceding year, late Irish currency, and they are elected for life. They are 12 in number. The Police Committee are elected annually from those inhabitants who have been rated for the previous year at 2*l.*, late Irish currency.

227. How many of them are there?—Twenty-one in number: not more than 21, nor less than seven.

228. How frequently are they elected?—The Committee yearly; the Commissioners after a vacancy takes place from non-residence or from death.

229. Are the numbers generally kept up to the highest amount?—They are not.

230. What is the actual number at this moment of each of the two bodies?—The Police Committee were elected about a fortnight ago, and have not all been sworn in. There are three not yet sworn in. There are 18 at present.

231. Are there 21 elected?—Always 21 elected.

232. Is there any vacancy in the number of 12?—There are three vacancies at present, in consequence of death, and there are some vacancies in consequence of non-residence.

233. How soon after a vacancy by non-residence is it filled up?—As soon as the Sovereign of the town chooses to do so.

234. You say they are elected by persons paying 4*l.* a year late currency: is that determined by the value of the houses?—It is.

235. Are the situations of the Commissioners of either of those Boards much a subject of ambition?—There is excitement sometimes created upon an election.

236. Mr. O'Connell.] Have they any salary?—No.

237. Have they any patronage?—I may say none.

238. Do not they appoint to any office?—They have the appointment of the clerk; they have the appointment of the night watchmen, the day constables and the superintendents of police.

239. Chairman.] Then they have patronage to that extent?—Yes; but it may be said to be no patronage.

240. But still persons are anxious to obtain those situations?—They are considered honourable situations in the town.

241. Theo it is an object for those bodies to see that the valuation is made upon correct principles, is it not?—Of course it is their desire that it should be so.

Mr. John Gilmer.

28 February 1837.

242. What are the dates of the Acts under which these Commissioners are appointed and have their power?—The 40 Geo. 3, and the 56 Geo. 3.

243. Are they general or local Acts?—They are local Acts.

244. Can you state upon what principles the valuation is made for the police rates in Belfast?—By the second Act the valuation is performed by four resident inhabitants of Belfast.

245. How are those four resident inhabitants appointed?—About the beginning of each year the Committee advertise for four persons to be assessors or valutors for the town of Belfast for the ensuing year, and the advertisement states the day of the appointment. Candidates appear upon the day, and the Committee select out of those candidates four persons, who are recommended to the Commissioners of Police to be valutors for the ensuing year.

246. Are there any qualifications necessary for a person to be appointed a valuator of police?—It is implied that he should have some knowledge of the value of houses.

247. Practically speaking, have those who have been appointed within your recollection a knowledge of houses?—I presume they think so, but I could not say whether they have or not.

248. Have they been appraisers, or have they been employed by other parties to value property?—There is generally one architect or superintendent of buildings; the others are generally from other trades.

249. How are they remunerated?—They are allowed by the Act of Parliament 50 *l.* Irish among them.

250. For the year's employment?—For the duty of valuating the town.

251. Is there any appeal given by either of those Acts from that valuation?—There is. Any person who considers himself aggrieved may appeal immediately after they have made the applotment of the town, which is done in the blotter, and it is copied from the blotter into this book (*producing the same*). The Act directs that the various properties of the town shall be classed under three heads: from 5 *l.* value to 20 *l.* the first class; from 20 *l.* value to 80 *l.* the second class; and all above 80 *l.* the third class.

252. Then are the Committee to understand that no class of inhabitants whose houses are of less value than 5 *l.* are ever inserted in the rate-book?—They are not entitled to be applotted for the police-tax by the Act.

253. Mr. E. Terment.] You have stated that they are to be divided into three classes; are the Committee to understand that the intermediate sums are placed down that they value a house at, 5 *l.*, 6 *l.*, 7 *l.*, 8 *l.*, and so on?—Yes; 5 *l.*, 7 *l.*, 11 *l.* and up to 19 *l.* are all in the first rate.

254. Mr. Hagg.] Are all persons intermediate between 5 *l.* and 20 *l.* rated equally?—Yes; all up to 20 *l.* are in the same class.

255. Will a person who occupies a house rated at 6 *l.* pay the same as a person occupying a house rated at 19 *l.*?—No.

256. Chairman.] You have stated that the houses are divided into three classes; do those three classes pay a different per centage upon the value?—Yes.

257. Suppose a person has a 20 *l.* house, what rate would he pay upon it?—Twenty shillings according to the rate of last year.

258. Supposing it was an 80 *l.* house, how much would he pay upon it?—Eight pounds.

259. That is 2 *s.* in the pound?—Yes.

260. And those above 80 *l.*, what do they pay?—Three shillings in the pound.

261. Therefore the object of the classes is as to the proportion of rate; but you split the classes themselves into different values, according to the real estimated value of the houses?—Yes.

262. In the 20 *l.* class, for instance, do the valutors state the value of the house as they consider it to be?—They do.

263. They do not split them again into further classes?—No.

264. And then they give a positive value to each house, as far as their judgment goes?—As far as their judgment goes, they do.

265. Upon the principle of giving a full value?—That is the oath which they have to take.

266. Is it the intention of the rating body at Belfast that every tenement should be rated upon its full value, or is it to be rated merely upon a relative value with regard to other tenements; that is to say, supposing the real value to be 10 *l.*, is it to be stated as 8 *l.*?—There is no instruction to the valutors to do any such thing.

The

The Commissioners of Police would not object to a house being 1*l.* or 2*l.* under, but they give no instruction to that effect to the valuers.

Mr. John Gibber.

28 February 1837.

267. Is there any appeal given on the part of persons who may conceive themselves aggrieved by the valuers?—There is.

268. Does that appeal equally embrace the parties saying that they are too highly assessed, or complaining that other parties are too lowly assessed?—Any appeals that I have ever seen only refer to themselves being overrated.

269. The appeal is to the Commissioners?—It is.

270. Are the Committee to understand that the Commissioners sit together, making one body, or do they make separate bodies?—They are two separate bodies; the Committee meet on Tuesday, every week, and the Commissioners meet on Wednesdays.

271. What are the several duties of those two bodies?—I can scarcely say; there are separate duties; the committee are appointed to carry this Act into execution. If there is any street that requires paving, or any part of the town that requires lighting, the committee examine it, and report to the Commissioners the propriety of having it done so and so. If the Commissioners agree to this, an order is entered in both books to that effect, and the work is proceeded with.

272. Then it is necessary that both bodies should agree before any orders can be given?—That is the regular way, unless it is a very trifling matter; and the one was intended by that means to be a check upon the other; but everything goes on without any jarring.

273. Can you state whether appeals are very frequent against the valuation of those valuers?—I think there are generally about 60 or 70 appeals. When this book is ready for the inhabitants to come and examine, they come and see what the value is, and if they are satisfied, they do not appeal; but if they think they are overcharged, they write to the Commissioners to that effect, and those are all considered at the first meeting. Sometimes it takes three weeks to get over the appeals.

274. Out of what number are there 60 or 70 appeals?—Six thousand one hundred houses.

275. Does that 6,100 houses include any under 5*l.*?—None.

276. And then those appeals are heard by the Commissioners, and determined accordingly?—They are, and if they appear frivolous the original valuation is confirmed; but if they are really too high value, the valuers are sent to re-examine, on whose report the Commissioners decide. A house valued at 20*l.* last year paid 20*s.* of police-tax, while another valued at 24*l.* paid 2*l.* 8*s.*

277. Then the appeals are more numerous upon houses that are above 20*l.* than upon any other class?—Whenever the applotment is above 20*l.* in consequence of being put into the second class, people naturally complain, and the same consequence takes place when they are above 30*l.*

278. There is not the same amount of appeals in any intermediate sums?—No; it is not so often the case.

279. Mr. O'Connell? Some people complain that they are rated higher than the amount of their rent?—Yes.

280. And the fact turns out so in some instances?—It does.

281. You know that there are many rated at less than their rent?—I have no doubt there are.

282. Is not that rather a numerous class?—I cannot say of my own knowledge, but I believe so; I have known some cases of it, and I dare say many cases might take place.

283. In short, it is not intended to lean upon the poorer classes?—We get very little from the poorer classes; under 8*l.* we get very little. In the first few pages of the book there is not a sixpence got.

284. Did you ever go round with the valuers yourself?—In some particular cases, after the time of appeal is over, 10 or 14 days are allowed, and the Commissioners are rather scrupulous about receiving any more, and sometimes I have known a single appeal come in some weeks afterwards, and it would be referred to me. I generally report that it would be better for the valuers to go, as it is a matter that I do not think myself competent to give an opinion upon.

285. Do you know whether the valuers examine the back premises with anything like minuteness?—I think they do not.

Mr. John Gilmer.

28 February 1837.

286. Is there a good deal of party-spirit in Belfast?—There is.
287. Can you find in that book, "John Mills, of North Thomas-street, pilot"?—Yes.
288. What is he valued at?—Six pounds.
289. Do you know what party he belongs to?—I do not.
290. Do you know whether he is registered as a voter?—I do not. I know from a pencil-mark that he has paid to myself the police-tax. I took the police-tax at the time of the elections and registries to accommodate the inhabitants of the town.
291. To entitle them to vote?—To entitle them to register or vote.
292. Do you see "Thomas Casement, of Dock-street, shipwright"?—I do not; there is no such name.
293. If the valutors considered his house under 5*l.* a year, he would not be here?—He would not; but Dock-street is a new street. There are five houses returned unfinished. Three of them are of 12*l.* a year each, and two of them 22*l.* each.
294. Do you see "Robert Spears, of Tomb-street, hutter inspector"?—I do.
295. What is he valued at?—Six pounds.
296. Do you know anything of his politics?—I do not.
297. Or whether he is registered?—I do not.
298. Do you see "John Madden, of North-street, chandler"?—Yes.
299. What is he valued at?—Six pounds.
300. Do you know anything of his being registered, or what his politics are?—I think from the pencil-mark he is registered. I generally mark down the rent that they pay, and I see 10*l.* marked down here. That is for the regulation of the assessors the next year.
301. Do you see "John Gordon, of Little Patrick-street, carpenter"?—Yes, "John Gordon, 6*l.*"
302. Look at "John Hogg, Pilot-street, blacksmith"?—There is no such street in the police-book. It is a new street at the New Dock. Here is "John Hogg, in Dunbar's Dock, 5*l.*," but I do not know whether that is the same person.
303. Do you know whether Dunbar's Dock has ever borne the name of Pilot-street?—It is very near Pilot-street.
304. Do you see "James Car, publican"?—There is a James Car next to John Hogg in Dunbar's Dock, 5*l.*
305. Do you see "Robert Holland, Molonee-road"?—There is no Molonee-road in Belfast, I think. It is part of Durham-street that is called Molonee-road. There is no such person here.
306. Have you Davis Usber in the same street?—I have.
307. What is he valued at?—Six pounds.
308. Look at "Robert Rogers, Barrack-street;" what is he valued at?—Nine pounds.
309. Are there two of them in Barrack-street?—There is another Robert Rogers in Barrack-street valued at 6*l.*
310. How is he described?—It is a workshop valued to him.
311. What is valued to the other Robert Rogers?—House and shop.
312. "John Allison, Institution-place, a carman"?—He is valued at 7*l.*
313. "Robert Dawson, at Hudson's Entry"?—He is valued at 7*l.*
314. "John Arthur, Great Patrick-street, dealer;" what is he valued at?—Seven pounds.
315. "Ralph Stockman, Nelson-street, sailer;" what is he valued at?—Six pounds.
316. Archibald Cunningham, Steam-hill-lane, lath-cutter;" what is he valued at?—Seven pounds.
317. "John Wicklow, of Brown-street, glass-cutter;" what is he valued at?—Seven pounds.
318. "William M'Lean, in Bell Entry, tailor;" what is he valued at?—There is a William M'Lean, not apploited in last year; but he has come in in the intermediate time, and has paid 5*s.* 3*d.* for taxes for a house valued at 7*l.* for three-quarters of a year.
319. "Samuel Sloane, Peter's-hill, haker"?—There is no Samuel Sloane in Peter's-hill apploited last year. There is a Mrs. Sloane; she is valued at 6*l.*
320. Can you state her trade?—No; there is no trade mentioned in this book.

321. Do you happen to know anything of the politics of any of those I have mentioned?—I do not. I know very little of the politics of any person of that description. I know the politics of the principal inhabitants of the town; but my situation precludes me from having anything to do with politics, and I know nothing of the politics of the lower classes of people. It is my business to attend to the register, for the purpose of receiving any police tax, if a person intending to register chooses to pay, as well as to give the barrister every information which the police-book affords, and the only way I could ascertain the politics of the person wishing to register, would be the side of the house from which he rises to go upon the table, and where he takes his affidavit from. This would however be very fallacious, for it often happens that when a man expects opposition, he goes to the opposite side to prevent opposition, and comes up under their auspices and takes his affidavit from that side, and neither side says a word to him.

322. Have you attended before Mr. Fogarty in that way, and produced your book?—I have.

323. Will you look at "Robert Bell, Lemco's-lane, labourer"?—There is no Lemco's-lane in this book. Here is Robert Bell in Market-lane, valued at 6*l*.

324. "Hugh McClelland, Edward-street, shoemaker"?—Six pounds.

325. Have you a "John May, in May's-lane"?—We have not. I recollect a man of that name that was registered at last session, and he is not in the book at all. I was present at the case.

326. His house is not valued at all?—No.

327. Mr. E. Tennent.] Are the houses in May's-lane valued?—There is no May's-lane in this book.

328. Mr. O'Connell.] Is it within the valuation district?—It is; I have it down in pencil mark: "May's-lane; John May sworn to be worth 10*l*."

329. Do you know anything of his politics?—I do not.

330. "Samuel Spratt, Edward-street, dealer"?—Six pounds.

331. "William M'Farlane, New Lodge-road, grocer." Is New Lodge-road there?—No; it is without the boundaries of the town; it is within the Parliamentary boundary, but without the police boundary.

332. "William Montgomery, of Durham-street or Molone-road, linen-lapper"?—Six pounds value.

333. Is the whole of Barrack-street within the police valuation?—It is.

334. "John Cotter, Barrack-street, shoemaker"?—Six pounds value.

335. "John Kennedy, Mill-street, painter"?—Seven pounds.

336. "John Magee, Union-place, cooper"?—Seven pounds.

337. "James Younge, Portland-place, labourer"?—Six pounds.

338. "John Leeson, Talbot-street, shoemaker"?—Six pounds.

339. "James Giffin, Edward-street"?—I have no James Giffin. I have a James Griffith, valued at 6*l*.

340. "Isaac Leadgate, Quay-lane"?—Seven pounds.

341. "Richard Dowd, Talbot-street, shoemaker"?—R. Dowd came in after the valuation. He has paid six months' taxes. I suppose he came in at August; he paid 3*s*. 6*d*; the value altogether is 7*l*.

342. It is presumed that they were not in the habit of coming in and paying fractions of taxes in that way before the registry?—We had a rate for portions of the property; we certainly have got them better in since the registry.

343. Have you "William M'Cluskey, in North Queen-street"?—There is no such name in North Queen-street.

344. That would be accounted for if his house was not worth 5*l* a-year?—Yes; or he might have come in and sworn before the barrister that he had been six months in a house that another man was apportioned for.

345. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Do you ever take into consideration any man's politics when you are about those valuations or collections of taxes?—I never take into consideration any man's politics. I take the taxes from all parties, when I get them.

346. Chairman.] Does garden ground or anything but actual shops and premises come into valuation?—Garden ground does.

347. Does the same property come into consideration under the Police Act as under the Reform Act?—The whole property ought to be valued; in taking the value, the waste ground ought to be taken into account. The Act directs that the first valuator "shall impartially apportion the several sums directed and appointed to be raised upon every occupier of any land, ground, house, lodging,

Mr. John Gibber.

28 February 1837.

shop, wharf, warehouse, coach-house, stable, cellar, vault, building, counting-house or place of carrying on business." That is the first Act, and the second improves upon it.

348. Practically, are all matters taken in under the 10*l.* qualification?—Some of the valuers are here, and they will be able to state it accurately.

349. You cannot answer that question satisfactorily?—I cannot.

350. Mr. E. Tennent.] You have been 10 years in this situation?—Ten to twelve years.

351. Has there been a great increase in the number of houses in Belfast during that period?—Very great.

352. Is there a calculation in your book as to the number of houses built annually and the number occupied in each year?—I did at one time keep an account of that description for my own satisfaction, or to satisfy any person that might require it; but I have not kept it for the last two years; I have the number of houses in the town. The total number of houses taxed is 5,888, and 251 vacant houses only.

353. Are you aware that there is a great increase of the streets in the town, especially in the lower class of cases?—There is a great increase of all kinds of houses; there are many houses of the very best kind that have been built since my time.

354. Are you aware that the great increase of manufactures in Belfast has tended to produce the building of houses for the accommodation of workmen in those factories?—It has; the increase of mills has increased the number of houses for workmen, and new streets have risen up within a few years.

355. There has been a considerable demand for houses the last two or three years?—There has been a great demand for houses.

356. Chairman.] Has that demand increased the value of houses?—I should think it would. I am not acquainted with houses, but my impression is that the demand for houses for workmen would raise the value of the houses; that would be particularly so in the immediate vicinity of the mills.

357. Does that answer apply to that part of the borough which is within the police district, or to that part of the borough which is without the police district?—My answer applies to that part of the town within the Parliamentary borough.

358. Has the increase within the bounds of the police borough been as great as that without?—Much greater.

359. Of what class of houses?—I think houses from 8*l.* to 10*l.*, or 12*l.* value.

360. Mr. E. Tennent.] They are in greater demand than before?—I should imagine so.

361. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Does that arise from the increase of trade and manufactures in the town, or from an anxiety to occupy houses in order to enjoy the franchise?—My opinion would be that it arises from the increase of spinning-mills, and not from any desire to enjoy the franchise.

362. There has been a great increase of mills, and therefore a great increase of demand for operatives who would be employed in those mills?—Yes; but that increase has principally taken place within the borough boundary; there are two mills without the borough boundary. I never was at those mills, and I am not aware of the number of houses near them.

363. Mr. E. Tennent.] Under these circumstances you conceive that landlords in Belfast are not likely to set houses under their real value from any difficulty in getting tenants?—I think from the small number of vacant houses there have been the last two years, landlords would be under no necessity to set their houses under their value.

364. Sir R. Ferguson.] Can you state the number of vacant houses in each of the last two years?—I have 251 last year, and 299 the year before.

365. How many the year before?—In 1834 the number of vacancies are not marked, but before the Committee meet again I will have an account of the vacant houses in each year from 1822.

Mercurii, 1^a die Martii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.
 Sir Robert Ferguson
 Mr. Miles Gaskell.
 Mr. Hamilton.
 Mr. Hogg.
 Mr. Serjeant Jackson.

Mr. Lefroy.
 Mr. O'Connell.
 Mr. Morgan John O'Connell.
 Mr. More O'Farrell.
 Lord Granville Somerset.
 Mr. Emerson Tennent.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

John O'Dwyer, Esquire, called in; and further Examined.

366. Mr. O'Connell.] DO you recollect what the lowest rate of valuation in the books of the police was of any house that you registered?—I do not recollect myself; but I have been informed that there was one instance in which a person who paid but 6 s. police-tax, was registered that his house was valued only at 6 l., and that that was the only case; but I do not know it at all of my own knowledge.

John O'Dwyer, Esq.

1 March 1837.

367. Do you recollect that in general houses valued at 7 l. in the police, were considered as houses *prima facie* fit to be registered?—No, I do not. It is five years ago, and the Committee must understand that I speak only according to my recollection; but if my recollection serves me at all, my answer would be, that they were disqualified *prima facie*.

368. Chairman.] Do you mean to say, that you required subsequent evidence to prove the value, or that they were actually disqualified?—I required subsequent evidence to prove the value.

369. Mr. O'Connell.] It became a question to be tried?—Yes.

370. You have no recollection of having registered voters that stood in the police books so low as 5 l.?—I have no recollection of it myself: I have been told that there was one case of a house that was valued at 6 l.; and I wish to state, that when I say this, it is possible that such cases may have occurred; but there must have been some special circumstances that took it out of the general rule, where such a thing did occur, if it did occur.

371. Then your recollection is, that you did not register several houses that were valued in the police-rate so low as 6 l.?—I have no recollection of having done so: if I did so, it must have been under strong special circumstances.

372. Would it refresh your recollection if the names and places were mentioned?—Not in the least. Out of 600 or 800 names in a town which I had never been in before, it is not likely that I could retain it.

373. Your recollection was so easily revived when Mr. Bates showed you the paper?—It was natural that it should be; for I had returns to make to Government of the numbers registered, and I took the numbers rejected for my own satisfaction. I had very frequently occasion to consider it; and therefore, when I saw those numbers, they came quickly again to my memory.

374. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Did Mr. Bates refresh your memory with any names?—Not at all.

375. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you recollect whether the valutors under the Police Act were personally sworn before you, and examined upon any occasion?—They were all sworn; they sat below me, and had their books, and I referred to them.

376. Were they produced to give evidence as to the value?—Some of them were, and I believe all of them.

377. Are you quite certain of that?—I am not quite certain that all of them, but I am quite certain that some of them, and there was one in particular, Mr. Francis Wray. I had every reason, from corroborating evidence, to place great

John O'Dwyer, Esq.

1 March 1837.

reliance on the evidence he gave; and I think he told the truth in every single instance where he was examined. So far as I could judge, he appeared to be perfectly free from any party bias in his evidence.

378. Would you be so good as to state who were the prosecuting counsel upon your circuit at the time Mr. Blackburn became attorney-general?—Mr. Scott, Mr. Smith, myself, and Mr. Plunket.

379. Were there no more?—There were Mr. Moore and Mr. Brewster, supernumerary counsel, to supply the place of any of the other four being absent.

380. Were Mr. Moore and Mr. Brewster removed by Mr. Blackburn?—Certainly not.

381. Did they continue the six as prosecuting counsel, four regulars and four supernumeraries, during Mr. Blackburn's continuing in office?—They continued exactly the same six; but there was a distinction made between the first two and the second two. There were some of the cases in which the Crown prosecuted, which were considered not of sufficient importance to require the whole four to be employed in them, and they were omitted in those minor cases.

382. Were the six taken in any minor cases?—No; there were never more than four taken in any case. The fifth and sixth counsel were for the purpose of supplying the place in case of the absence of any of the four.

383. Before Mr. Blackburn's time, did not the four get briefs in every case?—They did ever since I have been upon the circuit.

384. You were appointed before Mr. Blackburn's time?—I was. I was originally appointed a supernumerary by the present Lord Chancellor, Lord Plunket; and I was afterwards appointed a permanent counsel in the year 1828 by Lord Chief Baron Joy, I suppose in consequence of having been acquainted with the duty in acting as a supernumerary.

385. From that period, when you were appointed one of the four, did you get briefs in every case?—I did; and I considered that my appointment was a permanent appointment, and I devoted myself to it.

386. It was Mr. Blackburn that made the first change in it?—Mr. Blackburn and Mr. Compton; I understood that it was Mr. Compton who communicated to him that the Government considered the expense too much, and that it was considered desirable in cases where a fewer number could be done with to do so.

387. Are you aware that there were as many as 11 upon the Munster circuit at one time?—I never was upon the Munster circuit. The Committee will give me permission to add, that when I was appointed one of the four regular counsel I considered that I had a situation from which I was not removable. I entirely abandoned my civil business and devoted myself exclusively to the Crown business, which I considered was worth attending to, and the consequence is that I have completely lost my civil business upon the circuit, and it is impossible to regain the time I have lost; and I consider that it is a very great hardship in my particular case.

388. For how many years did you get briefs in every case?—I think in 1833 the change was made; the spring of 1833.

389. Mr. Joy became Chief Baron in the beginning of the year 1831?—He was Attorney-general in 1828 when he appointed me.

390. Then the amount of your evidence is, that in Mr. Joy's time there were four regular counsel who got briefs in every thing?—In Mr. Joy's time, and in the time of every one of his predecessors.

391. Were there ever more than four upon the Leinster circuit?—Never that I ever heard of. I think I should have heard of it if it had been the case.

392. Then up to the close of Mr. Joy's time, there were four that got briefs in everything, and two supernumeraries?—Two supernumeraries, who were never employed except one of the four was away. There were never more than four briefs given in any case.

393. In Mr. Blackburn's time that was altered thus far, that there were two who got briefs in everything, and two more who got briefs in the principal cases, but not in the minor?—In all cases when they were sent into another court where the two judges were sitting.

394. And two more, who occasionally got briefs?—Two more, who got briefs when any of the other four were away.

395. Then at present there are but four?—There are six; there are still two supernumeraries.

396. Who are the two supernumeraries at present?—I understand that Mr. Thomas Welch and Mr. Frank Thorpe Porter have been appointed supernumeraries.

397. Did you ever see them hold briefs for the Crown?—Not for the Crown; I only say that I was told it by Mr. Welch himself some time ago, that he and Mr. Porter had been appointed in the place of Mr. Moore and Mr. Brewster.

398. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Who was the Attorney-general when you and Mr. Berry Cusack Smith were dismissed?—The present Master of the Rolls.

399. You are perfectly sure that Mr. O'Loughlin was the Attorney-general when you were dismissed?—I am sure he was; and I think it right to add this, that it had been alleged that my removal and the removal of Mr. Smith had been the act of the present Mr. Justice Perrin. Shortly after it was stated, Mr. Justice Perrin came to me to assure me that it had not been done by him. I told him I was aware of that, for I had continued to hold briefs till he had ceased to be Attorney-general, in the same way as I had done before. He expressed himself kindly disposed towards me; and he said, as to the removal of Mr. Thomas B. C. Smith, that he would sooner have put his hand in the fire and burnt it off than removed such a man from the situation.

400. Does your recollection serve you as to its having been alleged in the House of Commons that it was Mr. Perrin who had dismissed you and Mr. Smith?—I read it in the Mirror of Parliament.

401. Do you recollect it having been at that time stated in the Mirror of Parliament that I had put a question in the House of Commons, as to whether you and Mr. Smith were dismissed by the Attorney-general, Mr. O'Loughlin?—It is so stated in the Mirror of Parliament in answer to a question from Mr. Serjeant Jackson by the present Master of the Rolls, then Attorney-general for Ireland.

402. Do you recollect the answer reported to have been given by Mr. Attorney-general for Ireland, that the dismissal was not by him but by Mr. Justice Perrin?—I do not think he used the word dismissal; but he said that the appointment of those gentlemen in our place was by Mr. Justice Perrin.

403. Are you aware of any other ground upon which your dismissal could have rested, save and except that which you stated yesterday?—I am not. I stated that yesterday, because it had been mentioned to me by some of the Bar, that Mr. Sance, who had been appointed in my place, had alleged that in conversation, I believe on the Bar-box, as the reason; and I know of no other ground whatever.

404. Mr. Justice Perrin told you, with regard to Mr. Thomas B. C. Smith, that he would rather have put his hand into the fire than have dismissed him?—He said that in a very warm manner.

405. Is it not the fact that there was not a more efficient counsel than Mr. Thomas B. C. Smith?—Scarcely a more efficient man at the Bar.

406. Were you in the habit of constantly attending in the discharge of your duty on the Crown Bar upon the Leinster Circuit, during the whole time you were one of the Crown counsel?—I think during the entire time I was counsel for the Crown the Judges were never sitting a quarter of an hour when I was out of court, except at the desire of the Crown solicitor, who sometimes said, "It is impossible for anything to come on to-day; you need not remain in court."

407. How long were you Crown counsel altogether?—I was two years supernumerary: I was from 1828 up to the time of my removal, three circuits ago.

408. How many years were you altogether a supernumerary and as regular counsel?—From 1826 to 1834; eight years.

409. Are you aware that Mr. Thomas B. C. Smith was counsel with Mr. Edward Pennefather in the remarkable case of Koox v. Gavio, when a question arose respecting a contempt of the Exchequer, when Mr. Pennefather and Mr. Smith were opposed by the Attorney and Solicitor-general for Ireland?—I know that he was, for I was present at the argument.

410. How soon after that arguement was it that he was dismissed?—The next circuit.

411. Did you ever hear of any other ground, or any objection made to Mr. Thomas Berry Cusack Smith; did you ever hear that he was negligent of his duty as prosecuting counsel?—Certainly not; no one could be more attentive or more useful.

412. Did you ever hear any reason whatever assigned for his removal?—I never heard any reason assigned.

413. You state that Mr. Welch told you, that he and Mr. Frank Thorpe Porter were

John O'Dwyer, Esq.

1 March 1837.

were appointed in the place of whom?—He did not name, but he said they were appointed supernumeraries; and I presumed it was in place of those who had been supernumeraries.

414. When was that appointment made?—This circuit it must have taken place, if it has taken place.

415. When did this conversation take place?—When Mr. Welch told me was just at the time that Mr. Richards was made Attorney-general: I am not sure whether he or Mr. Wolfe was just at the moment Attorney-general.

416. *Chairman.*] Was it subsequent to last circuit?—Yes, it was since Christmas.

417. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] Is this the Mr. Frank Thorpe Porter whose name has been mentioned in connexion with the removal of Mr. Lec from the shrievalty of the county of Westford, on the disapproval by the Lord Lieutenant of him; is that the Mr. Frank Thorpe Porter who is stated to have reported what he heard in conversation in the hall, as to Mr. Lee being an Orangeman?—These gentlemen are upon my circuit, and I do not like to answer questions that seem to bear invidiously upon men that I am in the habit of meeting and dining with. It is easy to get the facts, if they are material, from some other witness.

418. *Mr. Hamilton.*] You connected yesterday your removal from your situation with a decision which you had made as assessor; what was the correspondence, in point of time, between those two circumstances?—It was the next circuit immediately after the decision.

419. Was there an opportunity of removing you previously?—No, it could not have been sooner.

420. *Mr. Hogg.*] Was it usual to remove gentlemen from the situation upon the circuit which you had without assigning any cause?—I never have heard of any other Crown counsel ever being removed by an Attorney-general coming in before.

421. Was a new Attorney-general frequently in the habit of appointing new prosecuting counsel?—Never; I never heard of any instance: and I never should have neglected my civil business in the way I did, if I had thought it was a situation that I could be removed from.

422. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] Did Mr. Justice Perrin ever tell you that he considered that he had no right to remove the four counsel?—I might have understood him so; but I am not so certain of it as to state it in evidence.

423. Are you aware whether Mr. Welch and Mr. Porter are members of the General Association?—I am not.

424. Have you seen their names in connexion with the Association?—I cannot positively say; I may have a suspicion; but it is not such as would warrant me in saying it to the Committee.

Mr. John Gilmer, called in; and further Examined.

Mr. John Gilmer.

425. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Who are the present valuers for the police tax at Belfast?—The valuers for the present year are John Thompson, Francis Flood, James Kelly Patteson, and Francis Murray.

426. How long have they respectively been valuers?—The last two are only valuers for this year. The first two, John Thompson and Francis Flood, for the last three years.

427. None of them were valuers in the year 1832?—None.

428. You stated yesterday that your belief was, that they valued by outward inspection, and that they did not examine the premises?—I have often heard them state so.

429. Do you know of instances where the valuation of houses and streets has continued the same for several successive years?—I know of some particular instances of the same valuation returned for one year as it was the year previous; but I am not at this moment prepared to say that whole streets have remained the same. I know that a number of houses I am particularly acquainted with have been returned the same one year as in the previous year.

430. Are you aware that Mr. O'Dwyer registered as 10*l.* householders several persons who were valued at less than 10*l.* in the rate-books?—I am. This was the principle upon which all the barristers acted in Belfast. Every barrister, from the first, whose name I think was Mr. O'Dwyer, to the present barrister, registered those valued under 10*l.*

431. And heard evidence on both sides?—Yes.

432. Do you recollect whether Mr. O'Dwyer did not register some houses valued as low as 5*l.* in the police rate; for example, to refresh your memory, Johnson, who lives in Croakin's-place?—In 1832, Samuel Johnson is valued at 5*l.*

433. Do you know whether he was registered by Mr. O'Dwyer?—If it is the same person, which I think it is, Mr. O'Dwyer went down in the evening, and examined the house of this Samuel Johnson.

434. [Sir R. Ferguson.] What was the valuation of Johnson's house in 1833?—*£.* 8. in 1833.

435. Mr. O'Connell.] How long had it been at 5*l.* before that?—I did not bring any books before 1832, thinking it unnecessary, and therefore I cannot answer that question. The house is the same number in both years, but the valuation was raised.

436. Mr. Tennent.] Is that an usual case to occur in Belfast, that houses in successive years increase in value according to the estimate of the valutors, or is this a solitary instance?—If there is any improvement in them during the current year, the valutors are expected to make an addition upon the value.

437. [Chairman.] Are there any circumstances in Mr. Johnson's case to account for the increase from 5*l.* to 8*l.* in the course of that twelvemonth?—I do not know anything of the house at all.

438. Mr. O'Connell.] You said that Mr. O'Dwyer went to look at the house?—I recollect the circumstance of Mr. O'Dwyer going in the evening to look at the house.

439. Who were the subsequent barristers? Were they Mr. Curry and Mr. Fogarty?—I think there was an intermediate one, Mr. Maine.

440. Mr. Maine, and Mr. Carrey, and Mr. Fogarty; did they follow the same course as Mr. O'Dwyer?—During all the registries that I have attended, and I think I have attended all but one, there were individuals from 7*l.* under registered, and, in one or two instances, I recollect people being registered who were not valued at all.

441. That is, they were considered under 5*l.*?—Considered under 5*l.* by the four valutors.

442. Do you recollect the case of a man of the name of Billington in Mary-street?—John Billington, valued at 6*l.*

443. Do you remember whether he was registered in 1832?—I think he was.

444. Mr. E. Tennent.] Who is in that house now?—William Jordan is the person returned last year.

445. What is the valuation?—*£.* 8.

446. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you recollect the circumstances of the registry of Billington?—I recollect something peculiar about it. Billington's case was attempted to be made a precedent during the whole of the registry. He was very early in the alphabet, and very early registered. It was attempted to be made a precedent by the counsel for either side, just according as the circumstances answered those that they wished to make it available for. From a pencil mark which I have in the book, it appears that his rent was 10*l.* 10*s.* at the first registry, and during a number of the succeeding ones it was common for both political parties to have private valutors, who were able to give evidence of the value of the applicant's house on the one hand and who also were able to depreciate the value on the other. This system, however, is nearly exploded now.

447. Did Mr. O'Dwyer hear the witnesses on both sides and decide deliberately?—Yes, I believe so.

448. Did Mr. Currey follow the same practice?—Certainly, on both sides; and deliberately settle the matter according to his judgment, I believe.

449. Did you observe the same fair practice by Mr. Maine?—Yes.

450. And by Mr. Fogarty?—Yes.

451. [Chairman.] What was the session you did not attend?—I think it was the one at which Mr. Maine presided; I think it took place upon a Tuesday and a Wednesday, and those are two days in the week in which I am particularly engaged in my own office.

452. Mr. O'Connell.] But you attended at Mr. Fogarty's, according to the best of your recollection?—I did; that is, there was no registry that I was not present at, but not during the whole of each.

453. Were the four town valutors sworn on either side as witnesses upon the discussion

Mr. John Gilman.

1 March 1837.

discussion of the value of the houses before Mr. O'Dwyer?—The four valuers were not sworn; there were two of them sworn at the first registry, John Ward and Edward McCormack.

454. Was there a person of the name of Wray a valuator?—There was.

455. Was he sworn before Mr. O'Dwyer?—I do not recollect his being sworn; I have no doubt, however, of the fact if he acted for me. Sometimes when I was present Mr. O'Dwyer swore me to give evidence from this book, and I am sure that Mr. Wray would be sworn also.

456. To give true evidence of the contents of the book?—Yes.

457. But you never heard him brought on the table to be examined as to the value, and cross-examined upon either side?—I have no recollection of having heard it.

458. Were any of them examined and cross-examined before Mr. O'Dwyer as witnesses, as the private valuers were?—Mr. Ward continued a valuator for one of the parties for a few days.

459. Which of the parties?—I think it was the liberal party; but he refused to act longer than two or three days.

460. *Chairman.*] Are you talking now of the first registry sessions?—Yes.

461. How many days did the registry sessions last?—From 28 to 30 days.

462. Mr. O'Connell.] Were those valuers sworn before Mr. Curry as witnesses to the merits?—I have no recollection of the town valuers having been sworn before Mr. Curry.

463. Have you any recollection of their having been sworn before Mr. Maine as witnesses?—I have not.

464. Have you any recollection of their being produced by either side before Mr. Fogarty?—I recollect one of the valuers of last year having been sworn, I think before Mr. Fogarty; Jamieson was his name.

465. But it was not the practice to examine them as witnesses in each case?—It was not the practice to examine them in each case.

466. Are you certain that even Mr. Jamieson was examined last year before Mr. Fogarty?—Yes, I think he was examined in July sessions.

467. How often?—Once I am sure; about the case of a man with a pump well.

468. Then it was not the practice of either party to produce the town valuers as witnesses to prove the value?—No, it was not; there were special valuers for the purpose.

469. They were not resorted to as the ordinary witnesses?—They were not. If they were present, the person who was seeking to register might appeal to them to tell the value of his house; and I think it was under such circumstances that Mr. Jamieson was asked.

470. Did you see any partiality in the mode of registering voters in the town?—No, I cannot say that I ever saw any partiality.

471. In either of the assistant barristers?—Not in either of the assistant barristers.

472. Did not it appear to you that the evidence was weighed as fairly as each of those gentlemen could weigh it, and that he came to a conscientious decision, as far as it appeared to you?—As far as I am capable of judging, every case was decided upon its own merits.

473. Fairly and conscientiously, as you believe?—As I believe, fairly and conscientiously; I have no recollection of anything that I could blame; there was always evidence produced. I have heard the barrister frequently say, if the house was under 7*l.* in the police-books, that he could not admit the person without evidence. Evidence was adduced, and the man himself took the affidavit prescribed by the Act of Parliament, that his house was of the annual value of 10*l.*

474. Then whenever it was valued at 7*l.* in the police-book, it was considered a *prima facie* case for registry?—Not at first; at first it was 8*l.*

475. But it afterwards came down to 7*l.*?—Yes, in consequence of the number of cases where it was proved that they paid as rent more than 10*l.*, though valued at 7*l.*; the barrister, finding that that was so, reduced it to 7*l.*

476. Mr. E. Tenment.] What barrister did so?—I think it was done by all the barristers but the first, Mr. O'Dwyer; 8*l.* was what he stood by.

477. Who established 7*l.*?—I should not think 7*l.* was ever established as a rule, but evidence was required by the barrister when it was 8*l.*, besides the person himself swearing that it was worth 10*l.*

478. *Chairman.*]

478. *Chairman.*] The first barrister that acted took 8*l.* as the amount which formed a *prima facie* case?—He found that in all cases where 8*l.* was the value, the persons that applied for registry swore that they paid more rent than 10*l.*; then 8*l.* became the rule. I do not know that it ever became exactly the rule; but he did not require such particular evidence of a person that was valued at 8*l.* as he did at 7*l.*

479. You have stated that a change of that sum was afterwards adopted; by whom was that change adopted?—I think by the succeeding barrister; sometimes by Mr. O'Dwyer also; people were admitted who were valued at 7*l.*, because I see on opening the book of 1832, one person valued at 7*l.* I have here a private mark of 10*l.* for his rent.

480. *Mr. O'Connell.*] What is his name?—William Mitchell, of Mill-street, No. 16.

481. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] What is it valued at now?—No. 16 in 1836 is vacant, the value is 10*l.*

482. Will you see what it was in the intermediate years?—William Mitchell, in 1833, is valued at 12*l.*; in 1834, at 10*l.*; in 1835, at 10*l.*; and in 1836 the house is vacant, but the value is 10*l.*

483. You stated that the conventional rule acted upon by the assistant barrister was originally 8*l.*, and the barrister afterwards changed that to 7*l.* You said that Mr. O'Dwyer kept to 8*l.* as the standard?—I merely meant to convey what was my idea sitting behind the barrister. I am not aware that he made any rule; but when the police valuation was 8*l.* he did not require such a degree of evidence to prove the value to be 10*l.*, and this gradually came down to be 7*l.* Less evidence was necessary when the valuation of the house was 7*l.* than it was if it were 5*l.* I think the oath of the person was not taken in the first instance, but in that I may be mistaken.

484. *Mr. O'Connell.*] By the oath being taken, you mean that the oath alone was not considered sufficient?—He must have taken the oath, because that was the first thing that was done; but when the oath was taken the first question was, what are you rated at in the police books; or perhaps I was asked what is he rated at in the police books; if I said 5*l.*, then evidence was necessary to prove the house worth what the party had sworn it to be worth. Then the party who expected the applicant to register to be of their political opinions, replied We have evidence. This was generally the practice at the first register; it has gradually, however, given way.

485. *Chairman.*] You meant it has given way as to the amount?—No, the practice of having persons to swear to the value of houses.

486. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Both sides have given way?—The conservative party have had a man at the two last registries of the name of Smith.

487. Did he appear to be a paid man?—He is an architect in the town; I do not know whether he was paid or not. He had a book with the evidence, and when a man wanting to register was called upon, he got up and stated that he had examined the house of this person and found it to be so and so, as good as some other house that was registered previously.

488. Then he was supporting the conservative voters?—He was.

489. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Was there any similar person upon the opposite side?—There was some person examined in one or two cases when I was present upon the opposition side, but I am not aware that there was one regularly waiting there for the purpose of proving every case.

490. Was there at the sessions previous?—I rather think not.

491. At the sessions before that?—There was, I think.

492. And regularly before that?—And regularly before that, I think.

493. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Were the cases heard by each of those assistant barristers patiently and deliberately?—They were.

494. By every one of them without distinction; by Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry, Mr. Maico and Mr. Fogarty?—There is no case in my recollection where a decision was made with the least haste, or where any of the parties were prevented from adducing evidence for or against the applicants applying to register.

495. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Is it your opinion that the decisions were in every instance made according to the evidence submitted?—I am afraid that would be setting up myself higher than the barrister if I were to answer that; there is no particular instance in my recollection at this moment, of any case that was not decided according to the evidence brought before the barrister.

Mr. John Galwey.

1 March 1837.

496. *Chairman.*] Was it your impression that the decisions were such as an impartial man would come to, or not?—According to the evidence brought before the barrister, in my opinion, the decisions were according to the evidence.

497. *Mr. O'Connell.*] You mean fair and impartial, according to the evidence?—Fair and impartial, according to the evidence.

498. You apply that to all the four gentlemen?—I apply it to all, from the very first registry.

499. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] You say there was no haste in coming to a decision, nor were parties precluded from giving evidence such as might influence the decision. Are you aware of any decisions being come to without any evidence whatever beyond the mere assertion of the claimant?—No; I am not aware of a single case where a decision was come to without evidence being heard, if it was offered.

500. Are you aware, that throughout the course of the registry in January 1836, Mr. Fogarty laid it down as his doctrine, that if a claimant paying but 2 *l* rent asserted his house to be worth 10 *l*, he would register that man upon the *prima facie* evidence, unless there was evidence brought against him to show that his house was not of that value?—I was not present when any such thing was decided by him. If that was the principle laid down by him, I was not present.

501. *Mr. O'Connell.*] But you attended, did you not?—The registry commenced before I went. The January sessions began, I think, on Tuesday, and it was about one o'clock before I had permission to go. I dare not take those books out of the office without the authority of one of the boards; and at all events, Tuesday is a day that I cannot leave the office; but as soon as the chair was taken by one of the committee, I was ordered to go. It is as much for the interest of the town that I should be present as it is for the interest of the parties.

502. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Are you aware that it was the practice of Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry and Mr. Maine, that if a tenant came up to register paying a rent much below 10 *l*, such as 7 *l*, or 8 *l*, or 6 *l*, and where his house bore a corresponding value in the valuation by the police valutors, that they would not register him upon his own oath or assertion without that being corroborated by other evidence as to the value?—I am perfectly aware of the case being so. I think I have stated so in my examination to-day.

503. Are you not aware that a contrary course was laid down by Mr. Fogarty in court, and acted upon?—I recollect a man coming forward to register at the second registry, whose name was not in the police-books at all, and he swore that he paid rent to the amount of either 13 *l* or 15 *l*, and he was registered: he was not in our books at all.

504. Are you aware that that might occur, and does occur frequently, the municipal boundary not being correspondent with the police boundary?—That was in the town, in Glegg's Row or Lane, I believe.

505. *Mr. O'Connell.*] It was in that part of the town which ought to be in the valuation?—Yes.

506. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Are you aware whether it was included in the valuation in a subsequent year?—I think it was.

507. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Do you recollect the name?—I think Graham was the name. He was one of the labourers upon the streets, and that was the reason why I knew the man. I merely mention that to illustrate the point, that people living in small houses might be registered, although they were not upon the books at all, if they could show a good case.

508. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Where is the house?—I do not know exactly; it is immediately off Glegg's-row.

509. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Were any houses returned under 5 *l* value?—There are no houses returned under 5 *l* value.

510. The valutors are bound upon oath to return every house that is of 5 *l* value?—Every house that is, in their opinion, of 5 *l* value.

511. Then, in fact, the valuation is sworn to; the houses they omit are therefore, in their opinion, less than 5 *l* value according to their oaths?—Decidedly.

512. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] You have stated that the valutors, as a practice, were not examined in court at the time of the registry, but that in some cases they have been?—I think at first they were.

513. Although the valutors were not personally examined, was not their valuation brought in as evidence in every instance?—In every instance this book was brought in. The reason why they were not examined was, that they were not present.

present. I do not mean to intimate that they were at all considered incompetent.

514. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Were the gentlemen who were the valuers for the police at any period of the registry sessions interrogated as to the general accuracy of the valuations contained in the book?—I think they were.

515. Then the parties, in fact, received it as a sort of admitted fact that the book did contain a fair representation of the valuation?—I could not answer that question. I do not know how the parties did. When the valuation suited one party they insisted upon the valuation being correct; but if the valuation of the next person that came upon the table were to operate against them, immediately they said the valuation was not worth two-pence.

516. Chairman.] Both sides?—Both sides. If it was in their favour it was a very good valuation, and if it was against them it was not worth two-pence.

517. Mr. E. Tennent.] You adduced the instance of a man of the name of Graham as a case in which a man had come forward and sworn his house to be worth 10 *l.* inasmuch as he paid 13 *l.* for it, but that it was not included in the police valuation. Was that man registered?—He was, I believe.

518. By whom?—It was either the second or the third registry after the Reform Bill passed. It was not at the general registry, but the first or the second after the general one.

519. Was there any evidence required to substantiate that case?—Yes.

520. There was evidence required notwithstanding the man's oath that he paid 13 *l.*?—Yes; it not having appeared in the police books was the reason that additional evidence was required.

521. That was, according to your impression, under the second barrister, Mr. Curry?—I think it was the second. It was either the second or the third registry, and I think he was registered.

522. Mr. O'Connell.] Has the value of the houses been greater or less within the last two years in Belfast than before?—Decidedly the rents of houses have increased within the last two years. As a proof of the truth of my answer, I might refer to the number of vacant houses the last two years. The last year there were only 250 vacant houses. In 1835 there were 299. In 1834 there were 512. In 1833, 615. In 1832, 584.

523. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] What is the total number of houses in the town?—The total number of houses taxed is 5,888, and 251 vacant houses in 1836.

524. Chairman.] That is within the police district?—Yes; there are a great number of small houses in the immediate neighbourhood of Belfast that are not worth 5 *l.*; they are not taxed at all events.

525. That does not give the total of the houses within the boundary of the borough?—Decidedly not.

526. Mr. E. Tennent.] Then, according to your evidence, whilst the value of houses has been gradually increasing in Belfast, the standard of police valuation has been as gradually reduced in Belfast from 8 *l.* to 7 *l.*?—I am not aware of that.

527. Have not you stated that the barristers have reduced the standard of value from 8 *l.* to 7 *l.*?—I think I stated that at the first registry, where the valuation was 8 *l.*, there was less evidence required to prove the value to be 10 *l.* than there was if it was 7 *l.*, 6 *l.*, or 5 *l.* It happened afterwards, that if the valuation was 7 *l.*, there was less evidence necessary to prove the value to be 10 *l.* than there was at the first registry.

528. Mr. O'Connell.] Then whenever a house was valued in the books under 10 *l.*, there was a controversy as to the real value?—There was in general.

529. And cases of that kind were numerous?—Very numerous.

530. In the police valuations have you known instances where the valuation continued the same, notwithstanding alterations and additions to the house?—I have.

531. Are you acquainted with Mr. James Moore's house in Donegal-street?—I am; it is No. 29.

532. What is that house valued at now?—In 1836 it is valued at 50 *l.*

533. What has it been valued at in former years?—In 1835, James Moore's house in Donegal-street was valued at 40 *l.*

534. What was it in the year before?—£. 40 in 1834; 40 *l.* in 1833; 40 *l.* in 1832.

Mr. John Gilmer.

535. Do you know that that house continued rated at 40 *l.* for some years after it had been very considerably improved in value?—No, I do not.
536. Do you know Dr. Broom's house in York-street?—I do.
537. What is the number, and what is it rated at?—Dr. Broom is valued at 28 *l.* in 1835; No. 71.
538. Who inhabited 72?—There is no 72 in York-street.
539. Who inhabited 70?—There is no 70; the one side of the street is partially built.
540. Do you happen to know that his house and a house very materially different from it in value, were valued at the same rate, the house next it?—The house next it of James Campbell, 38 *l.*
541. Do you know anything of the real value of the houses?—I know from the outside of the house; I never was inside. There seems to be no difference in the outside.
542. You said that the valuations valued by the inspection of the outside?—So they tell me.

Mr. Solomon Darcus, called in; and Examined.

Mr. S. Darcus.

543. *Chairman.*] What are you?—Clerk of the peace for the county of Antrim.
544. How long have you been so?—Twenty-five years and upwards.
545. Have you brought the registry books with you?—I have brought the registry books of the voters.
546. Do you produce it now?—I do. (*Producing the same.*)
547. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Does that contain the registry under the Reform Act?—It does, from September 1832 up to the present time.
548. Are they entered alphabetically?—After the registry is made, which cannot be done alphabetically during the registry, there is an alphabetical list of the individuals at the end of the book.
549. Does that alphabetical list show the time at which each was registered?—It does not; but it has a reference by numbers, which numbers will give you the time.
550. Have you in your custody the original affidavits of all the persons that are registered?—Certainly.
551. Has that book been out of your personal custody?—In that of my deputy, but none other.
552. It has been in your office?—It has.

Mr. John Gilmer, further Examined.

553. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Can you inform the Committee whether, since the year 1832, there have not been several new houses built in Belfast?—A great many new houses since 1832.
554. Can you state what the increase is in the last two years?—I could not; I do not know; it would take a long while to ascertain the additional number of houses in each street.
555. But you know that a great many have been built?—A great many have been built.
556. And there are houses being built at present?—There are.
557. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Are the Committee to understand you that the general rule was to require evidence where the claimant's name was not in the police valuation, or where his house was valued under 7 *l.*?—Decidedly so.
558. *Mr. E. Teament.*] Always acted upon by Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry and Mr. Maize?—By all the barristers.
559. And by Mr. Fogarty?—And by Mr. Fogarty. I cannot recollect a case where it was a low valuation under 10 *l.*, where additional evidence was not required, although neither party had an objection to the person seeking to register. It sometimes happened that there was no objection on either side to the party seeking to register.
560. *Mr. O'Connell.*]—(To Mr. Darcus.) Be so good as to look at the list of registered voters, and see whether you find John Scott, of Edward-street, Belfast?—John Scott, labourer, Edward-street.
561. When was he registered?—The 14th of November 1832.
562. That was by Mr. O'Dwyer?—Yes.

563. (To

563. (To Mr. *Gilmer*.) What was John Scott's house valued at in 1832?—*£*. 6.
564. Mr. *E. Tennent*.] What is it valued at now?—John Scott, in 1836, is valued at 7*l*.
565. Mr. *O'Connell*.]—(To Mr. *Darcus*.) Be so good as to look for Francis Hunter, Caroline-street, teacher?—He is described here as Francis Hunter, gentleman, of Caroline-street.
566. When was he registered?—The 3d of November 1832.
567. (To Mr. *Gilmer*.) What is he valued at?—Francis Hunter is valued, in 1832, at 6*l*.
568. Mr. *E. Tennent*.] What is he valued at now?—In 1836 he is valued at 6*l*.
569. Mr. *O'Connell*.]—(To Mr. *Darcus*.) Be so good as to look for Thomas M'Allen, Peter-street, publican?—Thomas M'Allen, dealer, Peter's-hill, registered on the 26th October 1832.
570. (To Mr. *Gilmer*.) What is he valued at in 1832?—In 1832 he is valued at 8*l*.
571. What is he valued at now?—In 1836 at 7*l*.
572. (To Mr. *Darcus*.) Will you look for Francis Hannan, Shank-hill, starch-maker?—Francis Hannan, starchmaker, Shank-hill road, 3d November 1832.
573. (To Mr. *Gilmer*.) What is his valuation?—Shank-hill is not within the valuation of Belfast; Shank-hill was the original name.
574. What is it called now?—Peter's-hill; but there is no person of that name at Peter's-hill, and we have no Shank-hill.
575. (To Mr. *Darcus*.) Will you look for Robert Stewart, bricklayer, Carrick-hill?—I have a Robert Stewart, carpenter, of Carrick-hill, registered on the 7th of November 1832.
576. (To Mr. *Gilmer*.) What is he valued at?—Robert Stewart at Carrick-hill, is valued, in 1832, at 10*l*, and Robert Stewart at Carrick-hill, in 1836, is valued at 6*l*; there is a difference in the number. In 1832 he lived in No. 4, and in 1836 he lived in No. 6.
577. What is No. 4 valued at in 1832?—In 1832 No. 4 is valued at 10*l*, and in 1836 No. 4 is valued at 10*l*; No. 6, in 1832, is valued at 6*l*, and No. 6, in 1836, is valued at 6*l*.
578. (To Mr. *Darcus*.) Is the number of Robert Stewart's house specified in your book?—No, it is not.
579. *Chairman*.] Is he re-registered in 1836?—He is not registered at any subsequent period since 1832.
580. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Will you look for James Morgan, Charles-street, carman?—James Morgan, Charles-street, carman, registered on the 22d of October 1832.
581. (To Mr. *Gilmer*.) What was he valued at in 1832?—*£*. 5, and in 1836, 5*l*.
582. (To Mr. *Darcus*.) Will you look for William Adams, William-street, shoemaker?—William Adams, 26, William-street, registered the 13th of October 1832.
583. (To Mr. *Gilmer*.) What was he valued at in 1832?—In No. 20, William-street, there is John Adams valued at 8*l*, and in 1836 there is No. 20, William-street, William Adams valued at 6*l*; it may be the same person, because they very often make a mistake in the name.
584. Is there any other Adams in William-street?—There is no other.
585. Is there any No. 26 in William-street?—There is no No. 26 at all; No. 22 is the highest number.
586. (To Mr. *Darcus*.) Is there any John Adams registered in your book, in William-street?—Not any in that street.
587. Will you look for Henry Weir, William-street, grocer?—Henry Weir, William-street, grocer, registered the 8th of November 1832.
588. (To Mr. *Gilmer*.) What is he valued at?—Valued, in 1832, at 9*l*; in 1836 at 7*l*.
589. *Chairman*.] Now it appears that the valuation was higher in 1832 than in 1836?—It does.
590. Mr. Serjeant *Jackson*.] Can you account for why it is, that those houses appear to have depreciated in the valuation?—I cannot account for it at all. I do not know the man at all, nor anything about his house.

Mr. John Gilmer
and
Mr. S. Darcus.

1 March 1837.

Mr. John Gilmer
and
Mr. S. Darcus.
1 March 1837.

591. Do you believe that it can have been at all in consequence of voting in any particular way at the elections?—I do not know anything about him.
592. Do you believe that that circumstance can affect the valuation?—I cannot conceive of any such thing.
593. Mr. O'Connell.]—(To Mr. Darcus.) Will you look for John Campbell, North Queen-street, letter-carrier?—John Campbell, letter-carrier, North Queen-street, registered 1st of November 1832.
594. (To Mr. Gilmer.) What is he valued at?—Valued in 1832 at 7*l.*, and in 1836 at 7*l.*
595. (To Mr. Darcus.) Do you find William Graham, Union-place, printer?—William Graham, printer, Union-place, 2d of November 1832.
596. (To Mr. Gilmer.) What is he valued at?—£.8 in 1832, and 7*l.* in 1836.
597. (To Mr. Darcus.) Do you find William Maguire, of Talbot-street, nailer?—William Maguire, nailer, Talbot-street, registered the 14th of November 1832.
598. (To Mr. Gilmer.) What is he valued at?—Valued in 1832 at 7*l.*, and in 1836 at 6*l.*
599. (To Mr. Darcus.) Do you find John Gibson, Green-street, shoemaker?—John Gibson, of Green-street, shoemaker, 19th of October 1832.
600. (To Mr. Gilmer.) What is he valued at?—In 1832 John Gibson is valued at 7*l.*, and in 1836 at 7*l.*
601. (To Mr. Darcus.) Do you find Peter Armour, Talbot-street, labourer?—Peter Armour, of Talbot-street, labourer, registered the 24th of November.
602. (To Mr. Gilmer.) What is he valued at?—In 1832, 6*l.*, and at present 6*l.*
603. (To Mr. Darcus.) Do you find William Allen, of Carrick-hill, painter?—William Allen, of Carrick-hill, painter, registered the 14th October 1832.
604. (To Mr. Gilmer.) What is he valued at?—William Allen, in 1832, 5*l.*, and in 1836, 5*l.*
605. *Chairmen.*] Is there any other William Allen at Carrick-hill?—No, it is the same. It appears by a pencil mark that he was registered in 1832.
606. Mr. O'Connell.]—(To Mr. Darcus.) Do you find John M'Imley, of Market-street, nailer?—John M'Imley, of Market-street, nailer, registered the 26th of October 1832.
607. (To Mr. Gilmer.) What is he valued at?—In 1832, at 5*l.*, and at present, at 5*l.*
608. (To Mr. Darcus.) Do you find Hugh Stockman, of Market-street, labourer?—I have a Ralph Stockman, but I have not any Hugh Stockman in these years.
609. George Harcourt, Durham-street, pensioner?—Mr. Gilmer.] There was no Durham-street in 1832.
610. What was it called?—Sandy-row. Mr. Darcus.] I have no George Harcourt in these years.
611. Alexander Withers, Barrack-street, labourer?—Registered the 30th of October 1832.
612. (To Mr. Gilmer.) What is he valued at?—Valued in 1832, at 7*l.*, and 1836, at 7*l.*
613. (To Mr. Darcus.) Do you find John Swan, Back-lane, cooper?—Registered the 14th of November 1832. Mr. Gilmer.] Valued, in 1832, at 5*l.*, and in 1836, 6*l.*
614. (To Mr. Darcus.) Do you find Roddy Kane, Forest-lane?—Roger Kane, Forest-lane, cowkeeper, registered the 30th of November 1832. Mr. Gilmer.] Valued, in 1832, at 5*l.*, and in 1836, 6*l.*
615. To Mr. Darcus.] Do you find William Scott, of Cadell's-entry, printer?—Registered the 9th of November 1832. Mr. Gilmer.] Valued at 6*l.* in 1832, and at present, 7*l.*
- 616-17. (To Mr. Darcus.) James Hase, Berry-street, dealer?—James Hase, of Berry-street, grocer, the 2d of November 1832. Mr. Gilmer.] Valued then at 6*l.*, and now at 6*l.*
618. (To Mr. Darcus.) Will you look for William Mitchell, 16, Mill-street?—William Mitchell, cabinet-maker, Mill-street, registered the 5th of November 1832. Mr. Gilmer.] Valued at 7*l.* in 1832: it is vacant now; it is valued at 10*l.*
619. Was that the house that you said Mr. O'Dwyer went to see?—No, it was the

the house of a man of the name of Johnson, in Crookan's-place, that he went to see, as I was informed.

620. How are the commissioners of the police formed; how many are they composed of?—Twelve commissioners of police elected by the inhabitants; I confined myself yesterday to that.

621. Are there any more?—The sovereign and burgesses are commissioners *ex officio*.

622. How many are the burgesses?—I do not know.

623. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you know how many burgesses there are living in Belfast?—There is Mr. Stewart, the Rev. Mr. Macartney, and the sovereign; I do not recollect any other.

624. Mr. O'Connell.] Did you ever hear that the corporation consisted of the sovereign and 12 burgesses?—I think that is the corporation of Belfast.

625. Mr. E. Tennent.] You are aware that of those 12 burgesses scarcely any reside in Belfast, not more than three or four, or to the utmost five or six, and therefore do not act?—I believe that is the case.

626. Chairman.] Do you believe that as many as six burgesses reside at Belfast, and act as commissioners?—No, I am sure there are not six burgesses at present residing at Belfast.

627. Are there five?—I think not.

628. Are there four?—I recollect none but three, the sovereign, Mr. Macartney and Mr. Stewart; those are all that I summon to attend the commissioners' board.

629. Mr. O'Connell.] Have not more attended upon particular occasions at elections and appointments?—There is no election; there never was any appointment that I recollect since my acting as a clerk.

630. Do not they appoint house valuers?—The committee select four inhabitants, and send them up to the commissioners for their approval.

631. Who are the committee?—Twenty-one of the resident inhabitants, who pay 2*l.* of police tax, late currency, or upwards.

632. Are the majority of those conservatives or reformers, according to the general estimate?—I suppose the majority of them are conservatives; I have always heard it said so, but I never saw any party spirit in their deliberations.

633. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Or in their acts?—Nor in their acts, that is as members of the board; I know that some of them have more to do with political matters than others; I do not refer to that; I do not mean to say that the police committee are a dormant body, as individuals.

634. Mr. O'Connell.] Several of the committee are men who take a very decided part in politics out of the committee in the town, and are known to be strong politicians?—I think they are too independent gentlemen, in general, not to take a decided part. I recollect at the dinner lately, some of them were stewards at the dinner. That is my reason for saying that they are not dormant.

635. Have the valuers of houses any political opinions that you have heard of?—I know the political opinions of three of last year's valuers. There is one of the valuers for the present year that I am not acquainted with; I do not know his political opinions.

636. Who is he?—Francis Murray.

637. What are the political opinions of those you do know?—Two of them are conservatives, Francis Flood and James Kelly Patterson.

638. Who is the fourth?—John Thompson.

639. What is he?—I do not know that he ever registered.

640. You do not know what his political opinions are?—I do not know indeed.

641. Those whose political opinions you say you know, you only know from their votes?—From conversation. I do not know that they voted; I believe they did, but I am not aware of it.

642. What were the political opinions of those of last year?—Last year there were two that were the same, Mr. Thompson and Mr. Flood; and there are two new ones, Mr. Patterson and Mr. Murray.

643. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Have you ever seen any indication of party feeling upon the part of any of those police commissioners when acting as such?—No.

644. Could you from their acts or their deliberations have conjectured as to what political party they belonged to?—Not at all.

Mr. John Gilmer
and
Mr. S. Doreen.
1 March 1837.

645. Then it is your belief that they have acted with strict impartiality in the discharge of their functions?—I have no doubt of it.

646. Then what you say as to their being of conservative principles, is derived from the rumours you have heard, or what you may perhaps have heard said by them upon occasions foreign to their duties as police commissioners?—Altogether foreign; just in conversation, or from knowing that they have taken an active part in certain affairs belonging to one side.

647. Do you think there are many people in Belfast that have not political views on one side or the other?—I think there are very few.

648. Do not you think that people must be taken for any public office either from one side or the other, either from conservatives or destructives?—They must be taken either from one party or the other, or from both.

649. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you call anybody by the nickname of destructive?—No.

650. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Is Belfast divided now into two great parties as to politics?—It is.

651. Do not the whole mass of the population, the upper, the middling and even the operative classes range themselves on one side or the other generally speaking?—They do; they almost all have some political opinions.

652. Do not you know that there has been a great change in the town of Belfast of late years as to the general political bias of the great body of the people?—That is a question I could not answer.

653. How long have you lived in Belfast?—About 12 years.

654. Do you think the public sentiment has continued uniformly the same as between the two parties the last 12 years?—My reason for not being able to answer the question is, that the one party says there is a great accession of strength to their side, and the other party denies it.

655. Have you been dormant all the time?—All the time dormant.

656. You are a person of very great impartiality?—I intend to be impartial.

657. You keep aloof from parties on both sides?—I never registered, and I keep aloof from parties on both sides; I am acquainted with all the respectable inhabitants of the town of both parties.

658. Are you not aware that in by-gone times Belfast had the reputation of being a town in which the prevailing sentiment was radical. Had it not been so from the year 1798?—When I came to the town I understood it was a radical town.

659. Is not it remarkably different at the present time, and is not there a strong conservative feeling?—If I was asked if my opinion was confirmed as to its being a radical town, I should certainly say that my opinion was changed.

660. Has not it changed among the majority of middling, lower and operative classes?—It has changed among all classes, from the notion I had formed of it from hearsay.

661. With regard to the valuers, you have stated what class of men they are. You said that one of them is a builder or architect?—Yes.

662. Are they not respectable townsmen?—They are very respectable people.

663. From your observation of the conduct of those valuers, do you mean to lead the Committee to believe that those persons have been at all influenced by political views in their discharge of their duty as valuers?—I never have said anything, and I do not intend to say anything which would convey such an idea, nor do I now say so. I cannot conceive that political opinions would make a man after having taken an oath break that oath.

664. Then it is inferred that your opinion is that the valuers do conscientiously and accurately discharge their duties as valuers?—I cannot conceive that any person taking an oath would be induced by his political opinions to break it, nor can I believe that he would do it.

665. There was nothing came within your knowledge that would lead you to think that they ever did?—Nothing could possibly come within my knowledge; I was not present when they made the valuation; so that anything might be done in any part of the town without my knowing it; but still I say I believe they could not be actuated by any political motive, in either raising or lowering people's valuation.

666. Did you ever hear it imputed to those men, even in the town of Belfast, that they had been influenced by political feelings in their valuations?—Valuers

are people that are not very well liked, and people might impute things in anger without doing it in earnest.

667. Do you consider it to be the opinion of the population of Belfast, the mass of the people, that those men have accurately discharged their duty, or the contrary?—I never heard anything about it from the mass of the people.

668. You never heard any such imputation upon them?—I have heard words that forward people would say, "Oh, if I had been so and so, it would have been in such a way." But I paid no attention to such things; and if I had been asked about it, I should have said it was just a fool that used expressions of that kind.

669. It appears from your evidence that there has been a great fluctuation of value in many instances. Houses that were valued in 1832 at 10*l.* and 9*l.* are now valued at 7*l.*, and *vice versa*; sometimes those that were valued lower have been raised in value. Are you able to state upon what grounds that has occurred?—I do not know anything of it.

670. Is it the case that the value of houses in Belfast fluctuates, and that there is a greater demand for houses at one period than at another?—There are particular districts in the town where houses would rise and fall in value, according to circumstances.

671. And where they have risen and fallen according to circumstances?—If I were asked as to any particular house or street, I could not answer the question.

672. Is it not the case that in a particular street houses may be considered of more value at one time than at another?—Yes.

673. That one part of the town is more calculated for business at one time than at another time?—Exactly.

674. Mr. *Leffroy*.] Are there any times for a new valuation?—The Act of Parliament requires it to be done annually.

675. Would an alteration in the circumstances of the house, as to repairs and condition, occasion a different valuation?—Decidedly.

676. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Does not that depend upon the valutors seeing the improvement?—Certainly.

677. If the valutors judge by the external appearance, there may be valuable internal improvements which they have not seen?—It might happen.

678. Mr. *Leffroy*.] Or if a house falls into decay, and there are considerable repairs wanted, that would influence them the other way?—Decidedly; they value according to the appearance.

679. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson*.] Are you aware that in some of the cases you have mentioned, persons who may be considered conservatives have been valued higher in 1832 than they were last year?—I am not aware of the political opinions of a single individual whose name has been mentioned to-day.

680. Mr. *Leffroy*.] Have you heard any complaints of the valuation being influenced by the political opinions of the parties?—I have already stated that I have not.

681. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Have you heard it alleged sometimes?—I stated before that people will complain that people are of such and such an opinion; but I pay no attention to those kind of things.

682. *Chairman*.] Are there persons of all politics in the police committee?—I believe so; I believe the committee is divided.

683. Although the preponderance belongs to one party, still there are individuals of the other political party in it?—There are some whose political opinions I am not aware of.

684. Are you aware that there are any persons belonging to the other political party members of the police committee?—There are some new ones that I do not know what political party they are of, and there are one or two the last year that, I believe, are not conservative; but it is merely that I am told so.

685. Did you ever hear any of the police committee object to the conduct of the valutors in their valuations?—No objection is made; if there is any objection it is not made to them; if there is any objection made to any particular portion they are sent to review it.

686. Do any of the police committee, to your knowledge, complain of the conduct of the valutors?—I am not aware of any such thing.

687. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson*.] Can you call to mind any instance where any commissioner or member of the committee of police ever objected to the conduct

Mr John Gibner
and
Mr. S. Dwyer.
March 1837.

of any valuator as having been influenced by political opinions?—At present I have no recollection of any such thing.

688. Mr. E. Tennent.] You stated yesterday that annually, after a valuation, there were from 60 to 70 appeals?—I stated that last year that was the case, but I think there are more.

689. Do you remember any instance during the 10 years of your experience in which those appeals have been based upon the allegation of political partiality?—Not one; not a single instance that I recollect; it merely states that they are overcharged.

690. You said that the committee of Belfast is composed of men of different politics. With regard to the commissioners of police, are not some of the leading men in politics on both sides members of the commission of police?—I am certain of it.

691. Are you aware of any instance in the conduct of the commissioners of police, in which, either in their deliberations or their actions, you could trace a political bias?—Never.

692. And they are the leading men of the respective parties on both sides?—They are very high on both sides, some of them.

693. So that both the committee and the commissioners in Belfast are exempt from any such imputation?—I never, during all my experience, ever could trace any of their actions as commissioners, or as a committee, to be actuated by political motives.

Mr. Solomon Darcus, further Examined.

694. Mr. E. Tennent.] As clerk of the peace, you have always knowledge of any appeals which are made from the decisions of the registering barristers to the judges?—Yes.

695. Can you state whether, during the registration of Mr. O'Dwyer, any appeals, and how many, were prosecuted against his decisions?—Not any.

696. During the registration of Mr. Curry, who succeeded him, can you state how many appeals there were?—Not any.

697. During the registration of Mr. Maine, who succeeded Mr. Curry, how many appeals were prosecuted?—In April 1835, at the subsequent assizes, five appeals were made before Mr. Justice Johnson. Those were the first appeals in the borough.

698. Can you state the names of the appeals?—William Phillips, John Craig, John Medley, William Hay and James M'Mullen.

699. Who was the registering barrister during that period?—Mr. Maunc.

700. Do you know the grounds of rejection in those cases?—They were all on the lodger point.

701. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Was that the first time that the lodger point had been raised?—It was the first time that any appeal had been taken forward to the assizes of any kind against the borough registry, and those five appeals that were heard before Mr. Justice Johnson he did not adjudicate upon at the assizes; and the only intimation that I had of his adjudication was merely a note from his registrar, which note was not sufficient to authorize me to make a record in my book as a registration.

702. Was that after his lordship had gone to Dublin?—It was, and I believe all those five were afterwards registered immediately after that decision.

703. Chairman.] Did that note convey to you the decision of the Judges upon this point?—It did.

704. What was the decision?—"Reverse the decree;" it was a very extraordinary document.

705. Mr. O'Connell.] It went to allow the registry?—It did; it was a document that I could only present to the barrister at a future registry; but I could not enter it in the book as a registration.

706. The decision of the barrister was rejecting the registration?—Yes.

707. Will you deliver in that paper?

[The same was delivered in, and read as follows:]

County of Antrim:—Registry Appeals.

Mr. S. Dawson.

From the Assistant Barrister's Court, before the Hon. Mr. Justice Johnson, at Carrickfergus, on Thursday, 30th July 1835.

1 March 1837.

Civil Court:

In the matter of William Phillips, seeking to register as a voter: Reverse decree.

Like case, John Craig: Reverse decree.

Like case, John Medley: Reverse decree.

Like case, William Hay: Reverse decree.

Like case, James M'Mullen: Reverse decree.

(By order of the Court)

William Lewis, Register and C. N. P.

708. Was your reason for not acting upon it, that the judge's name did not appear upon it?—I must have the judge's signature to the book.

709. You did not think that a sufficiently authentic document?—No.

710. Mr. E. Tennent.] Were they all upon the lodger point?—In each of the cases a part of the house was let to some one else.

711. Mr. O'Connell.] Has the sixth appeal been tried as yet?—Yes.

712. Who was it from?—From Mr. Fogarty.

713. Were you present at the investigation?—I was not.

714. Are you not apprised that Mr. Fogarty recommended the appeal?—I do not recollect.

715. Can you state what the point was?—The office the party held not being a counting-house within the meaning of the statute.

716. Mr. Morgan O'Connell.] Was there any other appeal at the same sessions upon the same point?—Not any; those are all the appeals that there have been.

717. Mr. E. Tennent.] Who was the tenant in that case?—John M'Connell.

718. Mr. O'Connell.] Has that case been decided?—It is here. Chief Justice Bush signed the book reversing the order, and registering the individual at the Carrickfergus assizes in 1836.

719. Do you know what the politics of the individual were?—Indeed, I do not; I know very little about that.

720. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Are you as dormant in politics as Mr. Gilmer is?—I do not know any thing about that. As a public officer I have looked aloof from all parties.

721. Mr. O'Connell.] Did you frequently attend at the registry of votes?—Not at the borough of Belfast; I did not.

722. It was a deputy of yours?—Yes.

723. What is his name?—Hugh Orr.

724. Is he here?—He is not. It is right to state that at the time of the election of 1832, I had the borough of Belfast, the county of Antrim, and the borough of Lisburn; and the general quarter sessions came on at the same time; and it was impossible that I could attend them all in person.

Fueris, 3^o die Martii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.
Sir Robert Ferguson.
Mr. Milnes Gaskell.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Serjeant Jackson.
Mr. Lefroy.

Mr. O'Connell.
Mr. J. M. O'Connell.
Mr. More O'Ferrill.
Lord Granville Somerset.
Mr. Emerson Tennent.
Mr. Charles Villiers.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

John O'Dwyer, Esq., called in; and further Examined.

725. Mr. O'Connell.] WILL you have the goodness to look at your answers to questions 387 and 421, and state whether there are not five towns upon your circuit, namely, Wicklow, Wexford, Waterford, Clonmel and Kilkenny?—There are.

John O'Dwyer, Esq.

John O'Dwyer, Esq.

3 March 1837.

726. Were you in the habit of going to the Wicklow assizes before you became a Crown prosecutor?—I was; I do not think I ever missed, so well as I can recollect, with reference to 30 years ago.

727. When were you called to the Bar?—In February 1816.

728. There is very little civil business in Wicklow?—Generally very little; occasionally there is some.

729. Can you state what was the greatest number of briefs in civil business you ever had at any one assizes in Wicklow?—I do not think I ever had more than two at the most, because there are seldom more than three or four; seldom so many as four.

730. Will you say positively that you had two at any one assizes in Wicklow?—Yes.

731. Can you state what was the greatest number of briefs you ever had at Wexford at any one assizes?—No, I cannot.

732. Can you, from your recollection, give an approach to the number?—No, I cannot.

733. Can you say how many in Waterford?—No, I cannot say. I generally had two or three briefs in both Wexford and Waterford.

734. At Clonmel?—I had a good many. I cannot say how many; it was my own county, and I had more acquaintance there; I had more briefs there.

735. What was the greatest number you had in Clonmel?—I would say I had five record briefs upon an average before I became Crown prosecutor.

736. Did you attend the Kilkenny assizes?—I did; I very seldom had civil business in Kilkenny. But the Committee will understand this, that a man who is attending a circuit and has some civil business of course, has a prospect and expectation of its increasing; and a man who had two or three briefs eight years before, at a time when he was advancing every year, had a reasonable expectation that his civil business would have increased if he had been able to attend to it, and to devote his time to it as it requires. I did not hold out to my professional friends or others a desire or anxiety to get civil business, which I knew I could not attend to, attending to my duty. I do not mean to say that I laid down a practical rule of exclusion, so as to say positively that I would not take it, because I did hold some briefs in particular cases, where, from the state of the Crown business, I was able to attend to them; but, practically, it acted as an exclusion of me from the civil court.

737. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Was the period of your standing at the bar, at which you were appointed one of the Crown counsel on the Leinster circuit, the period of a man's professional life at which he is very likely to make a spring in his profession?—It is; I consider that it is just the most critical period.

738. At that time you were in very respectable civil practice?—I was in some tolerably respectable practice as a junior at the bar.

739. If it be generally understood that a gentleman has undertaken another branch of the profession, and that he intends to devote himself diligently to that other branch, must not that necessarily have the effect, whatever his own inclinations may be, of turning away the attention of professional men and clients from him in regard to civil business?—I would say decidedly, that an attorney would employ a junior counsel whose services during the entire trial he could calculate upon; and it is totally impossible to calculate upon the attendance of a man engaged for the Crown in the Crown Court, even during a reasonable portion of the trial.

740. You have stated, that at the period when you were appointed one of the Crown counsel upon the Leinster circuit, at Wicklow, you had two briefs; now does it not frequently happen that there are not even so many as two records at Wicklow?—It frequently happens that there is but one.

741. At Wexford you had two or three briefs, and likewise at Waterford; is there any great quantity of civil business at either of those places?—The average at Wexford may be about five, and at Waterford about six.

742. With respect to Clonmel, which is the assize town in your county of Tipperary, you had as many briefs as five?—Five, certainly.

743. Upon the average?—Indeed I think upon the average.

744. Is not that unquestionably the best town upon your circuit?—Decidedly. There is an average of 12 records tried, and there are generally from that to 16 or 17 records entered.

745. Then is it right to infer from the evidence you have given on this subject that, practically speaking, you have lost your position on the civil side of the court upon

upon

upon the Leicoster circuit?—I have, practically speaking, lost my position upon the civil side, even though I had never held a brief previously, because I had every prospect of getting into business from my standing upon the circuit, independently of any business I had previously.

746. With regard to the business at Dublin, has it had a prejudicial effect upon your practice in Dublin?—Of course the law business of any lawyer will, in a great measure, depend upon the quantity of circuit business he has. My business in Dublin has been almost entirely equity.

747. A great deal of the term business arises from preparing proofs and pleadings preparatory to the circuit and matters arising out of the trials upon the circuit; and the necessary result of your being prejudiced in your position upon the circuit has been likewise to prejudice you in your position at the Four Courts?—I conceive that it has.

748. From your experience at the bar, should you say that a man of your standing getting out of his position is a circumstance peculiarly injurious to him, and does not it become peculiarly difficult to regain his position?—I conceive it is nearly impossible; so much so that I should quit the circuit now, but for the advice of my friends that I should not do so; that I should still give it a trial, notwithstanding that it is not very probable that I should be able to recover my position.

Mr. John Thompson, called in; and Examined.

749. *Chairman.*] WHAT are you?—An architect and builder at Belfast.

750. Do you hold any official situation there?—I have been a valuator for the police committee.

751. How long have you been a valuator for the police committee?—I have now commenced the fourth year.

752. Have you been a valuator for the whole of the town, or only for a portion of it?—For the whole of it.

753. You have completed three years?—I have.

754. Will you state how you proceed to ascertain the value of houses in Belfast, for the purpose of the police rate?—We have a book, what we term a blotter, which the four valutors take with them from house to house, and they value each house separately in this book.

755. Do you mean to say that all the four valutors go together?—They all go together.

756. Is that for the purpose of checking each other?—The four valutors must come to one decision on every house.

757. Then every house is valued by all the four valutors, and those four valutors must agree in the valuation before it is entered in the book?—Yes.

758. Are you all sworn to do justice?—We are sworn by the commissioners.

759. How are you remunerated for this trouble?—The first year we had some little above 17 *l.* apiece, and the last two years we had 20 *l.* each as the town has increased.

760. Have you any perquisites or other emoluments for discharging this duty?—Not any.

761. Do you revalue the houses every year?—Yes.

762. How many are there within your valuation?—I cannot state the number.

763. How long does the valuation take you?—In general about three months.

764. Do you mean by that from day to day, or occasionally during three months?—Occasionally.

765. How many days are you actually employed in the valuation?—I would suppose we would be employed from 21 to 25 days.

766. By "days," do you mean the whole of the day?—We generally commence each day about 11 o'clock, and continue at our business till four.

767. Is it your business to go into the houses if there is any difficulty as to their value, so as to see what back premises there may be?—Sometimes when I found the door was shut, I have asked the question of the tenant who lived in the house, and we have several times been hindered going in to see the premises. Others were quite willing to let us in.

768. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Did you, in point of fact, go into the houses?—We did, in several places.

769. *Chairman.*] Have you any power to go in?—I believe we have none.

Mr. J. Thompson.

3 March 1837.

776. Mr. O'Connell.] Did you ever increase the valuation by going into the premises?—It happened sometimes that on going into the premises we would find, in the internal part of the house, some buildings or some accommodations that we were not aware of, and in consequence of this, then we raise the valuation.

771. Can you recollect any one instance in which you increased the valuation by going into the premises?—I think a person of the name of Mitchell, in Mill-street, No. 16.

772. But wherever there were improvements in the premises that would increase the value, parties would be likely to be anxious to shut you out?—I could not say as to that; I would naturally suppose they would not wish to be over highly taxed.

773. But in any case in which they complained that the valuation was too high, in that case they would be apt to allow you to go in?—In that case they always applied to the commissioners, and the commissioners have sent us back to revalue.

774. Can you mention anybody else but Mitchell?—I cannot exactly state.

775. What is Mitchell's address?—I think it is, "William Mitchell, Mill-street, No. 16."

776. Had he been valued at all before this time?—He had.

777. Do you remember at what?—If my memory serves me right, it was 7 *l*.

778. How much did you increase it to?—It was increased to 10 *l*.

779. Mr. Emerson Tenant.] On the other hand, in going into the houses, have you any recollection of having decreased the valuation of the previous year?—I do not recollect any one instance.

780. Do you recollect an instance of a house in York-street, next door to Dr. Broom's?—I do.

781. Is that an illustration of the question just asked you?—I believe the person that belonged to that house applied to the commissioners to say, that he was over-rated. The commissioners sent the valuator back; and in re-valuing the house, if my memory serves me right, I think we lowered it on entering the house.

782. You have read the Act of Parliament, a portion of which refers to yourself, under which you are constituted a valuator?—I have; but I do not exactly recollect the whole substance of it.

783. Do you conceive by the terms of the instruction which that Act gives to you, and by the oath which you take, that you are to give a positive value to the houses; a just, fair, and impartial value to the houses?—As near as we possibly can.

784. Had you any instructions from the police committee in regard to taking the positive value?—Not the slightest; neither the commissioners nor the committee.

785. Do you regard the valuation of each house as you have inserted it in your list to be the positive and *bona fide* value of that house?—As near as we possibly can. If any way, rather leaning to the inhabitants.

786. Mr. O'Ferrall.] Does your valuation generally correspond with the rent?—In some cases we might accidentally ascertain the rent, and in that case we should not exceed it; that is, if it was an annual rent.

787. Mr. O'Connell.] Have you any doubt that the annual rent, in very many instances, is more than your valuation?—I think it is a little more, for we in general lean a little to the inhabitants; as I said before, if we move from either side of the oath that we have taken, it is in the slightest degree in favour of the inhabitants.

788. Mr. O'Ferrall.] You give the inhabitants the benefit of any doubt upon your own mind?—Yes; when three out of the four are satisfied, and the fourth is not satisfied, then we give way in some slight degree to the inhabitants in that case.

789. Mr. C. Villiers.] Do you always ask what the rent is?—Not always.

790. Mr. O'Connell.] In general you value the house from the outside?—Yes; by the superficial appearance.

791. And go through many streets without going into one house at all?—A great many.

792. Is it an exception for you to go into a house?—When we have an opportunity we go in.

793. But you have not that opportunity often?—We have not; we have not always an opportunity.

794. Have you it often?—We have it sometimes; I cannot say exactly to the number of instances.

795. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Can you say in what proportion; whether one out of 25, or one out of 30?—It would be altogether a guess.

796. Mr. Lefroy.] Have the inhabitants an appeal in your valuation?—Yes.

797. Mr. O'Connell.] You can form a guess whether you go into one house out of 100?—It would only be a guess with me.

798. And you cannot guess it?—I would not like positively to say that we do.

799. Would you positively say that you go into one out of 300?—I am sure we do; I would not have any doubt in saying positively that we do.

800. Will you say it positively?—I would suppose we do.

801. The question is, whether you will positively assert that you go into one house out of 200?—No, I will not.

802. Will you positively assert that you go into one house out of 300?—I will.

803. Are you quite prepared to assert that positively?—Yes.

804. Mr. Emerson Tennent.] Is it your general impression that you have no right and no power to go into houses for the purpose of examining them?—It is.

805. Have you, in many instances, applied for permission to do so?—We did where we found any doubt upon our mind.

806. In those cases have you been in every instance admitted?—Not in every instance.

807. What proportion do the refusals bear to the admissions?—I would suppose about one-half, but it is only a supposition.

808. Mr. Morgan O'Connell.] Do you mean that you were admitted into half the number of houses where you asked for admission, or into half the number of houses that you were refused?—I suppose about one-half of the cases where we made inquiry.

809. Mr. Emerson Tennent.] In those in which you were refused, have you found them generally to be the better class of houses, or the poorer class?—I could not exactly state that, because we found both better and worse.

810. Mr. O'Connell.] That is, you found some houses better than you thought from the outside, and other houses worse than you thought from the outside?—Yes.

811. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] When you were not allowed to go into the houses, did you take any measure to get a view of what the real value of the house might be, where it was practicable for you to take a view of the back of the house and what buildings there might be behind?—We do not go to ladders or anything of that sort.

812. Are there not in Belfast, lanes and streets running at right angles to other streets, which would enable you sometimes to get a view of the rear of the houses fronting a certain street?—We might in some instances go there, and where it was practicable that we could see the back of the house, we did it.

813. Mr. O'Connell.] But that was in few instances?—That was in few instances; but where we could get it we did.

814. Mr. O'Ferrall.] Will you state what rule the valutors adopt for their own guidance when they set out on their valuation?—At first, when I became a valutor, we had the old books with us through the town, and from those books I ascertained the line of value that the other valutors had taken, and we proceeded as near to the same line of value as possible.

815. You have stated that you are a builder; could not any other person, who is not a builder, value just as well upon the old books, by comparison, as you, who are a builder?—Nearly the same, unless there are improvements; unless there were new additions, or new buildings.

816. How do you know what state the buildings were in when they were noted in the old books?—I know what state they were in when I saw them the first year when I became a valutor.

817. Will you state what additional information you were able to acquire?—My conclusion was, that a house that would cost 120 *l.* or 130 *l.*, was worth 8 per cent. per year.

818. How did you estimate the house to cost 130 *l.*?—By being constantly in the habit of building this description of houses, and in fact, all descriptions of houses, in Belfast.

819. Did you ever measure the front?—We did in several instances.

820. Did you take the height and depth?—No.

Mr. J. Thompson.

2 March 1837.

821. Then how could you form an estimate?—I have been so much in the practice of building, that I could tell within about 10 *l.* or 12 *l.* in 130 *l.* or 140 *l.*, what the house would cost building.

822. Without taking the depth or the height?—Without taking the depth or the height.

823. Does not the interior fitting of a house make a considerable ingredient in the expense of erecting it?—Certainly, if there is a quantity of division-walls, they add to the expense, and the description of trimmings to the windows and doors.

824. Then how can you form a perfect valuation of the house, if you neither take the height nor the depth, nor examine the interior fitting of it?—Houses in general, in Belfast, that run about two and three stories high, generally have one rule of fitting up inside: houses about four and five stories high, go to a better description of fitting up.

825. Mr. O'Connell.] How long have you been in Belfast?—About eight years.

826. Will you pretend to say, that a house valued upon the superficial view you take of it, might not be much more valuable, or much less valuable, than the estimate you form of it?—Neither much more nor much less; there might be some trifling difference.

827. You do not pretend to say, that your valuation is a positive valuation?—Not exact to the real value of the house.

828. How much per cent. might it vary?—I cannot exactly say.

829. Can you give a guess at it?—As nearly as I can answer the question, it is what I mentioned before.

830. Chairman.] Does it always follow, that because a house of that description is better fitted up in the interior, that it produces a better rent?—If one house is better fitted up in the interior than another, it will certainly produce a better rent.

831. Then do you mean to say, that if one house of the class of 130 *l.* happens to have cost 140 *l.* in the construction, on account of its superior fittings, that you must give eight per cent. upon the additional expense of construction?—Yes; in the same proportion up to a certain class, up to the amount of about 20 *l.* rent.

832. When you get to the class above 20 *l.* rent, what would be your answer to the former question?—A house above 20 *l.* we would not consider the proprietor entitled to the same per centage, but less.

833. Mr. O'Ferrall.] From the answers which you have given, you would be disposed to admit that your valuation is not always the most accurate valuation?—It is as near to it as we can ascertain.

834. You admit that a man who has the advantage of going into the house in order to value it may value it at a much higher sum than you value it at?—It might be the case.

835. Mr. E. Tennent.] Or a lower?—Or a lower.

836. Mr. O'Ferrall.] If a man going into a house finds it well fitted up with interior accommodation, would he not value that house at a higher sum than he would have valued it from viewing it on the outside?—He might value it either higher or lower, according to the internal accommodation.

837. Mr. C. Villiers.] Are you ever called upon to value houses for individuals in your professional business as a surveyor?—I am many times.

838. Upon what rule do you proceed when you value a house for a person?—I measure the brick-work, and I calculate it to be worth so much a perch. We have a standard rule in Ireland for brick-work.

839. Do you do nothing else?—I go through the whole of the house and measure the different parts of the house, and then sum up the items, and I find then the value of the house.

840. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then you do not confine yourself to the outside in those cases?—Not in that case.

841. That is when you are valuing for private persons?—Yes.

842. Then there is a distinction between your valuation for the public and your valuation for private persons?—There is; having so much of this description of valuation to do, I do not find it necessary to go into all the houses.

843. But when you are valuing for private persons you do find it necessary?—When I am valuing for private persons I have then to go to every item as near as I can.

844. Mr.

844. Mr. C. Villiers.] Whenever you make an accurate valuation you go inside the house, and proceed as you have stated?—Yes.

845. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] When you are valuing for private persons there is no difficulty in getting inside the house, because they give you every facility?—Exactly so.

846. You are never refused access to the interior?—Never.

847. Therefore you always avail yourself of that?—Yes.

848. And you would do so in the other case, if people would let you into their houses?—If I was admitted I would not just go to that extent; but if I was admitted I would go partly to it.

849. Mr. Emerson Tement.] Do not you discover that there is more difficulty in putting a value upon houses of 20*l.* rent and upwards than upon houses of a lower description?—Certainly, there is more difficulty.

850. In houses above the value of 20*l.* there is a greater difference in the style of internal fitting up, which might add to or diminish the value of the house?—Certainly.

851. In the houses in Belfast from 10*l.* downwards, so low as 7*l.* and 6*l.* there is very little difference in point of style as to internal fittings up?—I might almost say none at all, unless it is a very old house.

852. So that an internal inspection is not so necessary for the purpose of establishing the value as it would be in cases of houses of a higher class?—I do not consider it so.

853. Mr. O'Connell.] How are you paid when you measure houses, and value them?—Five per cent. for the whole amount.

854. Are you paid that when you value for a tradesman, or for the owner of the house?—It does not signify who I value for; that is my rule of charge.

855. Mr. Emerson Tement.] So that you would consider that an outward view of houses of the lowest class, from 10*l.* and downwards, would be generally sufficient to fix the value; but that in houses of a better class, some alteration might be made from your valuation by an internal inspection?—There might.

856. Mr. Charles Villiers.] Do you consider the rent as evidence of the value?—It does sometimes guide the valuers if they can ascertain it; but that is a matter that is very seldom ascertained.

857. Mr. O'Connell.] If the rent was low, would not they tell you that very readily?—I think they would.

858. Is it not the object of every householder to have your valuation as low as he can?—Certainly.

859. Mr. C. Villiers.] Do you always ask the rent?—No.

860. Do you ever ask the rent?—We do sometimes, but very seldom.

861. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] The rent would not always be a certain guide as to the value, because sometimes fines are paid?—We take care to notice those matters. If ever I do ask the question, "What rent do you pay for the house?" I immediately then ask, "Do you hold under a lease, or as an annual tenant." If the person holds under a lease, the rent then is no guide to us whatever.

862. You would require to know whether a fine was paid, and how much, in order to enable you to make use of the rent as a standard of the value?—We then go by our own judgment as to the appearance of the house.

863. But if you did inquire as to the rent, would you not then likewise consider it necessary to inquire as to the amount of the fine paid?—I do not recollect any circumstance of that sort.

864. Would not you likewise find it necessary to inquire, whether the party who was subject to a certain rent had made improvements in the house after the contract?—I in general ask that question, or if there is any improvement since last year; some properties are improving, others are decreasing in value.

865. Generally speaking then, the rent would be a standard of the value; but it is not always, because there may be a fine, or there may be improvements in the house after the contract is made?—If my own private opinion and the rent come any way near together, then I give the tenant the benefit of the difference.

866. Mr. O'Connell.] You said that the rent was no criterion of the value when there was a lease; is not it a criterion of the value to the extent of the rent, though the house may be more valuable?—We do not take it as a criterion.

867. Do not you consider where a house is held by lease, that it is at least of the value of the rent, though it may be more?—In many instances we do.

- Mr. J. Thompson. 868. Do not you in all?—It altogether depends upon the state the property is in.
 3 March 1837. 869. Would any man agree to pay a rent for a house if he did not think it was to him of the value of the rent?—I should think not.
 870. Mr. Emerson Tenment.] Might not that house fall in value before the expiration of the lease?—It is possible that it might decrease in value.
 871. Mr. O'Connell.] It is possible that it might fall down altogether?—It is.

Mr. John Gilmer, called in; and further Examined.

- Mr. John Gilmer. 872. Mr. Emerson Tenment.] A question has been asked the last witness with respect to increasing the value of houses upon a second inspection; and he has referred to the case of Mitchell, 16, Mill-street; will you refer to your books and see what the value of that house was in 1832?—William Mitchell, 16, Mill-street, in 1832, is valued at 7 l.
 873. Have you any means of ascertaining whether he was registered as an elector in 1832?—I presume, from a private mark in the book, that he applied to be registered; I think it appeared in evidence on Wednesday that he was registered.
 874. What was it in 1833?—£. 12.
 875. Mr. O'Connell.] You have not a prior book to 1832?—No, I have not.
 876. What was it in 1834, 1835 and 1836?—In 1834, 10 l.; in 1835, 10 l., and in 1836, 10 l.; it was vacant last year.
 877. (To Mr. Thompson.) Is it apportioned this year?—No, it is not; the valuation is not yet completed.
 878. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you think it can often occur that a house valued by you at 5 l. or 6 l. can be really worth 10 l.?—I think it quite impossible, unless in those cases where improvements have taken place, and we could not see them.
 879. Do you think it could often occur that improvements could take place to the extent of raising the value so much without your seeing them?—They might.
 880. Chairman.] Do you attend the registering barristers?—Very seldom.
 881. Have you ever attended?—I would sometimes go in of my own accord for about half an hour or so.
 882. But you never attended as an official valuator?—No.
 883. Mr. O'Connell.] Were you ever examined as a witness before him to prove the value?—Never.

William Mayo, Esq., called in; and Examined.

- W. Mayo, Esq. 884. Chairman.] YOU are a barrister?—I am.
 885. You have also been assistant barrister and chairman for the county of Antrim?—I have.
 886. As such, have you presided at the registry sessions of Belfast?—I have.
 887. What was the period of your appointment as assistant barrister?—In the spring of 1834. The first sessions, I think, were the April sessions of 1834.
 888. Whom did you succeed?—Mr. Curry; he died.
 889. How long did you continue assistant barrister?—Until after October 1835; the October sessions was the last sessions at which I sat.
 890. Were you then removed to another county?—I was; to the county of Mayo.
 891. Are you still assistant barrister of the county of Mayo?—I am.
 892. Who succeeded you in the county of Antrim?—Mr. Fogarty.
 893. Mr. Emerson Tenment.] You were removed from Belfast after October 1835?—After October 1835.
 894. There had been an election at Belfast immediately preceding that?—Some short time preceding it.
 895. At which Mr. Dunbar was returned in opposition to Mr. Tenment?—I do not recollect that it was immediately preceding the time of my ceasing to be assistant barrister. I know it was during the time I was assistant barrister.
 896. Chairman.] Do you recollect Mr. M'Canoe's death?—Yes I do, perfectly well; it was in the year 1835, I think.
 897. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Are you able to call to mind whether it was not in

the month of August 1835, that the election took place to supply the vacancy of Mr. M'Cance?—I think it was in the summer.

898. You know that the general election took place about Christmas 1834 and the beginning of 1835?—That is the one that I was alluding to.

899. Do not you know that a vacancy did occur afterwards by the death of Mr. M'Cance?—Yes.

900. Now, having had your recollection refreshed, are not you able to call to mind that the election to supply the place of Mr. M'Cance took place in the month of August?—I think I can; I recollect the riots that occurred, and that it was in a summer evening, and that it was after the summer session.

901. Do you recollect that at the last sessions at which you presided you had to try several of those rioters?—Perfectly.

902. Mr. *Emerson Tennent*.] Have you any means of stating to the Committee the number of persons registered by you in the town of Belfast?—I took from the lists within these two days. I cannot positively say that it was accurate; but I saw the book in which the registry was, and I think it amounted to 778 *l.* or some such number, under 800 *l.* The only means of knowledge I have is, that I looked to the registry-book in which the entries were.

903. In how many sessions was that?—Seven sessions.

904. Can you say what were the principles upon which you went with regard to evidence, for the purpose of substantiating their value?—I think where the tenant was a yearly tenant, the rent he paid was the best guide, and one which I most looked to; and I think the next to that was the rate at which they were valued in the police books. I think in the first instance those two were the materials generally upon which the decision was grounded.

905. Have you such a recollection of the mode of rating at Belfast as to state what sum in the police valuation you consider to be equivalent to a 10 *l.* house?—A 10 *l.* house would be rated at 9 *s.* 1 *d.*

906. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Was there any amount of valuation in the books of the police under 10 *l.* which you considered as a criterion of the house being of the value of 10 *l.*?—No, I should say not what I consider a criterion.

907. Mr. *Emerson Tennent*.] You have stated that the rent was the criterion by which you went in the first instance; that you were likewise guided by the police valuation. Suppose a man's rent was under 10 *l.* a year, and you saw him valued in the police book at 7 *l.*, 6 *l.* or 5 *l.*, what would be the course that you would take then? Would you register him upon his own assertion that the house was worth 10 *l.*, without requiring evidence to support it?—Generally speaking, I would not. If the rent being under 10 *l.* concurred with the police tax, being considerably under what I should call the rate at which a 10 *l.* house would be valued, I should consider those two circumstances sufficient to raise a suspicion of the value, I would not credit a witness entirely in opposition to those.

908. In such case you required corroborative evidence?—Yes.

909. Mr. *Lefroy*.] At what rate did you understand 10 *l.* houses to be valued in the books?—I understood that the houses were put at 11 *d.* for each pound. If, therefore, I saw a person with a 10 *s.* rate, I would know that that house must have been valued at more than 10 *l.*

910. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson*.] Was there any other criterion upon which you acted, or did you take a number of criteria into your estimate, when you were deciding upon those votes?—I never acted upon any one criterion.

911. Then you acted upon rent and taxation, and evidence and other circumstances, in all cases?—Certainly, where a difficulty arose.

912. And you did not feel yourself precluded or concluded by any evidence of rating or any evidence of rent; but you went generally into the facts of the case?—I never recollect that I laid down any rule of the kind at all.

913. Was it your impression, with regard to the police valuation book, that the valuation in the police-book represented the actual real value of the house, or that it was rather under or over?—The impression in my mind was, that it was rather under; and also that it was not a correct criterion; because I understood that the valuation was very much from the external appearance of the house.

914. Then your idea was, that, generally speaking, the valuation in the police-book was an approximation to the actual value, rather under than over, and in some cases erroneous, by reason of there not having been a perfect inspection and a thorough valuation of the houses?—Certainly.

W. Mayne, Esq.

3 March 1837.

915. And you felt it your duty not to rely exclusively upon that valuation; but to look at the rent, and at other circumstances?—Certainly, in some cases. If the police valuation was much above 10*l.*, I would say it was conclusive, unless it was explained: and in like manner, if the rent that the tenant paid was 10*l.* and above it, and there were no special circumstances in the case, and that the claimant made an affidavit that it was of that value, I would consider that conclusive, unless it was opposed.

916. Suppose it appeared before you that a man was rated for a house worth 8*l.* a year, would you act upon that, or require further evidence to be brought before you?—If he was rated at 8*l.* it would depend upon what his rent was?

917. Then finding him valued at 8*l.*, you would require some evidence of his rent?—Yes.

918. If his rent was under 10*l.* a year, what would you do then?—I would then examine him as to the facts. I would ask him, perhaps, what rent had been paid by the former tenant; why he got it under the value; and a variety of other circumstances. He might perhaps say that he was a punctual tenant, and he got it cheaper than another one.

919. Supposing the rating were 9*l.* a year, would that be satisfactory to your mind that he had a 10*l.* house, without other evidence?—If the rating was 9*l.* a year, and the tenant paid 10*l.* a year rent, there is no doubt it would.

920. But suppose he paid 10*l.* a year rent, let the rating be what it might, would not that give him a 10*l.* qualification?—Not necessarily.

921. Are men in Belfast in the habit of paying more rent than the value of the house?—Sometimes a man may take a house supposing it to be of the value of 10*l.*, and he may find that he is paying too much; and if the fact of his paying 10*l.* a year rent was met by the fact of the tax being only for a 5*l.* house, then it would throw a doubt upon my mind.

922. *Mr. Emerson Tenment.*] You have stated that during the period you acted, you registered about 700 electors?—780; as I took it from the book.

923. How many appeals were there against your decisions?—I do not believe there were any appeals prosecuted except one set; several appeals taken upon the same point.

924. What was that point?—It was upon the lodger question, whether a householder could vote out of a house, part of it being let to lodgers. It was raised by counsel; and the authorities produced appeared to me strong; and after a good deal of consideration, there was a kind of arrangement that the voter should be rejected, and the question decided upon appeal; I am pretty sure that was the only appeal.

925. *Mr. O'Connell.*] That was a disputed question among both the bench and the bar at that time?—I believe so.

926. Did not you, in every case in which there was an objection made to your registering, go into as much evidence as the parties chose to produce on both sides?—Surely.

927. And took into your consideration in forming your judgment all the evidence adduced?—Surely.

928. Parol evidence, by swearing the witnesses upon the table?—That was the usual course.

929. Did not you find that both parties were ready to object, and that they offered evidence in most instances to sustain their objections in any doubtful case?—I think always, where there was almost the shadow of a doubt.

930. They attended before you by agents and counsel?—Two or three agents very often, and always counsel, except one or two sessions.

931. And they were strongly battled on both sides?—I never saw a registry battled so strongly in any place.

932. Then you had to decide judicially in each case upon the entire matter?—I had.

933. Have you any doubt that you registered many persons who were valued below 10*l.*, and a good deal below 10*l.* in the police-books?—I am quite sure I did.

934. Have you any doubt that you registered persons valued at 8*l.*, 7*l.* and 6*l.* in the police-books?—Indeed I think I did; it is most likely that I did.

935. And you did not feel yourself at all concluded by the police valuation?—Certainly not; and I so expressed it at the time.

936. *Mr.*

936. Mr. *Lefroy*.] But in those instances where the valuation was low in the police-book, you registered them on the production of other evidence?—Special circumstances very often; the trade might give a value, and the situation of the house, which the police valuator did not look to so much perhaps.

937. Mr. *O'Connell*.] You found, in many cases, considerable difficulty in arriving at a satisfactory result?—Great difficulty; there was generally very contradictory swearing.

938. Mr. *Hamilton*.] In fact, was it your invariable rule to require evidence where the valuation in the police-books was so low as 5*l.*, or the rent under 10*l.*?—I cannot positively say.

939. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Had you any invariable rule at all?—No invariable rule, unquestionably.

940. You took each case upon its own merits, according to the evidence before you?—Precisely.

941. In every instance was the man coming to register bound, first of all, to swear to the value in his own opinion?—No, that was done by affidavit; he was questioned as to where his house was, as to what rent he paid and the amount of tax; and he was asked how long he had had it, and whether it was worth so much. If he answered all those questions satisfactorily, and there was no opposition, he was registered.

942. And if there was opposition, you heard the case fully?—Yes.

943. Did not some of the cases occupy an hour or two before you?—Yes, witnesses were examined for more than an hour often.

944. Mr. *Hamilton*.] After the examination of the claimant, if it appeared that his rent was under 10*l.*, and the police valuation of a lower amount, would you then consider that it required other evidence?—In general; unless he gave satisfactory answers, I always then inquired why it was that he valued his house so high, when his rent was less, and when the police books valued it at so much less. If he then gave me a satisfactory reason for it, and there was no opposition, I registered; but if, upon the evidence, I had doubts of the value, then I did not register him, although there might be no opposition.

945. Mr. *M. O'Connell*.] How many appeals were there from your decision upon the lodger point?—There was only one tried; it was agreed that they should all abide that one.

946. And if that one was decided in favour of the claimant, that the others should be re-registered at a future sessions?—Yes, which they all were.

947. When was that appeal made to the going judge?—That appeal, I think, was taken at the April sessions, and heard at the summer assizes of 1835.

948. Do you remember how many cases remained over upon that point?—There were a great many; I should say, perhaps above 30, because, after that decision, whenever there were lodgers, the case stood over to abide the event of that appeal, and there were many of them.

949. Mr. *O'Connell*.] There was no opportunity of taking the opinion of the judge upon it, unless you rejected the vote?—No other opportunity. I said that I had great doubts about it; but I was so pressed by the authority of a case decided in the King's Bench here, that I thought it the best way to reject the vote, for the purpose of having the question tried by appeal: it was so understood by the bar.

950. Mr. *M. O'Connell*.] You presided at the October sessions in 1835?—I did.

951. Do you remember how many of those whom you had rejected upon that point, at the April sessions previous, you registered after the decision of the judge at the October sessions?—I do not think any, because the case was reserved by judge Johnson for the twelve judges.

952. Then none of those cases of persons who, having been rejected by you in April, had not appealed to the court, but had waited for the decision of the court upon the point of law, came before you for registry at the October sessions?—I think not, because the judge referred the point to the twelve judges, and they did not meet till November.

953. And those October sessions in 1835, were the last sessions at which you presided as assistant barrister at Belfast?—Yes.

954. Mr. *Lefroy*.] At present there is no cross appeal against the admission of a voter; does it appear to you desirable that such a cross appeal should be given?—I certainly think it would be very desirable.

955. In the last instance you alluded to, in order to obviate the want of that, you

W. Mayne, Esq.

3 March 1887.

you were obliged to reject the voter for the mere purpose of having the question tried, although you would otherwise have admitted him?—I think that if the appeal could have been tried either way, I should have preferred admitting him.

956. *Chairman.*] It was a doubtful case, which involved general principles?—It involved general principles; it would have disfranchised a great portion of the constituency of the kingdom if it had been decided the other way.

957. *Mr. Emerson Tennent.*] Upon what principle did you reject the claimant; was it upon the ground of the want of legal possession within himself, or upon the ground of his not retaining within his own hand a portion of the house equal to 10 *l.* in value?—The ground of rejection was, that he was not in the actual occupation of the entire of the house out of which he claimed the vote, without any reference to the value; the question arose upon the word "actual."

958. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Is not it your opinion that it would be preferable for the assistant barristers not to have this jurisdiction, with respect to the registry?—I think in the present state of politics, perhaps, they would be more useful as judicial officers if they had it not.

959. To a certain extent, in spite of the utmost disposition to impartiality, are there not unpleasant suspicions given out by partisans on both sides frequently?—There must be. It is in the nature of things, particularly with the class of people that assistant barristers have to deal with.

960. Those that are rejected will be throwing the blame upon the feelings of the judge rather than his want of judgment?—Yes; I think that is pretty much the case.

961. And therefore you yourself, with a view to the purity of the judicial office, would prefer that some other tribunal had the registering of the votes?—I do think so, in the present state of parties in Ireland.

962. *Chairman.*] Supposing the present system were to be changed, in what way would you have the appointments made?—That is a question I have not considered. My idea would be that once a year would be quite sufficient for registration.

963. Supposing the registration was to be once a year, would you propose that the whole of the registration should be revised once a year?—Certainly.

964. *Mr. O'Connell.*] And that a man should vote immediately after he had been registered, and not wait for six months?—If the whole was to be revised all who were on the registry before should vote immediately.

965. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Even though there were a cross appeal given, should you think it desirable to have an annual revision?—Yes, I would.

966. Do you mean an annual revision to re-investigate all the rights, or only to ascertain where the right had failed since the last registry?—I mean to investigate where the right had failed.

967. But not to re-investigate the original title?—No, I do not mean that.

968. *Mr. Hamilton.*] You mean a power of appeal every year?—Yes, for causes of objection arising subsequently to the registry of the vote.

969. *Chairman.*] Are you aware of what the law is in England?—Perhaps I am not; I supposed it to be a kind of power of appeal against each voter once a year.

970. Are you aware whether objections may be made at a certain period of each year against every part of the registry?—No, I was not aware of that; I think that would be attended with great mischief in Ireland.

971. *Mr. O'Connell.*] You have not read the English Act?—No, I have not.

972. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Is there not a great deal of difference of opinion among the assistant barristers about the meaning of the word "qualification" in the Reform Act?—Yes, I think it requires an alteration, which I think would be a very simple thing.

973. What would you suggest?—That the value of the holding should be what it would fetch in the market.

974. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Do not the barristers act upon that principle?—Many of them do.

975. *Mr. Emerson Tennent.*] Does your memory serve you to state whether any persons presented themselves to be registered before you who had been rejected by your predecessors, Mr. O'Dwyer and Mr. Carry?—I think several.

976. Do you recollect what course you pursued in cases where no additional evidence was produced before you to prove the value, or to disprove the circumstances under which they had been rejected before?—I think I judged for myself upon

upon the evidence given before me; of course receiving it with great suspicion, in consequence of the former rejection.

977. You are not able to state whether, in any instance, you registered men upon the same evidence which had been rejected by Mr. Curry or Mr. O'Dwyer?—I cannot say.

978. Mr. O'Connell.] You do not know what evidence was produced before the former harristors?—No, except by it being stated that such witnesses were examined.

Mercurii, 8^a die Martii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Lord Granville Somerset.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Lefroy.
Mr. Serjeant Jackson.
Mr. Emerson Tennant.

Mr. O'Connell.
The Attorney-General for Ireland.
Mr. Charles Villiers.
Mr. More O'Farrell.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. John Bates, called in; and Examined.

979. *Chairman.*] ARE you residing at Belfast?—Yes.

980. Are you a solicitor?—I am an attorney.

981. Have you any knowledge of the mode of proceeding which has taken place at the registry of the voters for the town of Belfast?—Yes.

982. Were you the agent for any political party in those proceedings?—Yes.

983. Were you a paid agent?—Yes.

984. For which political party were you a paid agent?—The conservative party.

985. Mr. Emerson Tennant.] Have you attended professionally at all the registrations which have occurred at Belfast since the passing of the Reform Act?—I have, with the exception of the registry for April 1835.

986. Who was the barrister at that register?—Mr. Mayne.

987. Are you aware of the principles and the system upon which Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry, Mr. Mayne and the present registering barrister have proceeded?—Yes, I have a recollection of those principles.

988. Can you state the numbers who have been respectively registered by those gentlemen?—I have made out, from the list of the clerk of the peace and other documents, upon the accuracy of which I can rely, a table of the claimants, registries and rejections from October 1832 up to and including the January registry of 1837.

989. Can you state the number of claimants at the registry of October 1832?—In October 1832 my memorandum of the number of applicants was 3,375, and of the persons registered my memorandum was 1,642. Since my arrival here I have communicated with the clerk of the peace, and he states to me that the total claimants were 3,366. I should add that he tells me he has not the last sheet of the list of claimants, at least he has not the sheet on which his name ought to appear; and he has stated to me that there may be more names; his number of persons admitted was 1,659. The total number of persons rejected at that sessions was 189.

990. *Chairman.*] Will you explain in what way rejected?—Fifty rejected for want of value, eight for short occupation and 131 upon miscellaneous grounds.

991. Mr. Emerson Tennant.] What do you mean by miscellaneous grounds?—I mean such as the party being wrongly named; an incorrect christian name for instance; or the name of the street wrongly given, or claiming to register for a house, while the claim ought to have been for a warehouse or a shop; in short, all other grounds except those which I have specified.

992. Mr. O'Connell.] Will you state what those other grounds are?—Unless I went over the 131 names I cannot state the grounds.

993. Can not you divide them into classes?—I will divide them into any classification that the Committee requires.

Mr. John Bates.

8 March 1837.

994. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Do they admit of classification?—I cannot be sure of that till I read them over again. I think it would be difficult to classify them.

995. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Having classified those who were rejected for want of value, and those rejected for short occupation, can you, from your experience of the proceedings in that court, state any other substantial ground than some mis-statement of one kind or other in the claim?—Yes; a large number were rejected on the question of joint-tenancy. There were some also rejected on the ground of being, not the tenants, but permissive occupants under the masters of houses or shops.

996. Does not that come into the class of mis-statements if they had given notice as occupiers and they turned out not to be occupiers?—No; I would say that does not come under the head of mis-statements, because the decision in that case was, that the applicant had no right to claim.

997. Because he was a servant in possession and not an occupant?—Yes; but I would not call that a mis-statement.

998. Is there any other head of rejection except the four you have stated, namely, joint-tenancy, occupation as a servant, short occupation and want of value?—At present I am not able to mention any other class, but that being the first sessions the grounds of rejection were numerous.

999. Mr. *E. Tennent*.] Amongst those were there none for the non-payment of taxes?—I should think so.

1000. Mr. *O'Connell*.] You will be able to furnish a classification of them?—I will if the Committee desire it.

1001. *Chairman*.] You stated that there were 3,375 persons who applied to be admitted; that there were 1,642 admitted, and 189 rejected. Now the two numbers of 1,642 and 189 do not make up 3,375. What was the reason of the non-admission of the number above the 1,642 and the 189?—A great number of persons who had given notice to register did not prosecute their claims, and some of those persons, I believe, sent in duplicate notices.

1002. Do you mean to say that the whole of the number forming the difference between 3,395 and the two other numbers, forming together 1,831, came under the description of parties who made an application in the first instance, but never made their appearance before the registering barrister?—Either they or the party who expected they would act with them gave notices for them. They gave notice in every case where there was a colour of a claim; but when the barrister decided a case upon which their right to register depended, they did not afterwards appear to prosecute their claim, having had a decision upon similar cases in the instance of other people. In January 1833 the number of claims was four, and the number admitted was four. That sessions took place immediately after the general registration, so that the claimants were few; and I should state that neither I nor any other professional person attended that sessions. That sessions was held before Mr. Curry, the then assistant barrister for the county of Antrim. In April 1833 the number of claimants was 411. Out of them there were registered 94. The total rejections were 15; four upon the ground of want of value, three short occupation, and eight on miscellaneous grounds. In July 1833 the claimants were 375; registered, 56; rejected, three. There were none rejected for short occupation, one rejected for want of value, and two upon other grounds. In October 1833 the claimants were 355; registered, 68; three rejected; one for short occupation, one not value, and the other for some other reason.

1003. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Up to October 1833, inclusive, Mr. Curry was the barrister?—He was. In January 1834 his son acted as assistant barrister. Mr. Curry, the former assistant barrister, was either dead at that time or very ill, and his son acted as his deputy; his name was Alexander Curry. At the sessions at which he acted, namely, January 1834, the claimants were 296; registered, 41; rejected, one. That rejection was on the ground of want of value. Mr. Mayne acted as assistant barrister for Antrim at the following sessions, namely, in April 1834. The claimants then were, 365; registered, 65; rejected, six; for short occupation, four; not valued, two. In June 1834 the claims were 419; registered, 81; rejected, eight; one for short occupation, none on the question of value, and seven on other grounds. In October 1834 the claims were 467; registered, 69; rejected, two. Neither of those rejections was for short occupation or want of value.

1004. Mr. Mayne still continued the barrister?—He did. In January 1835 the claimants were 487; registered, 107; rejected, four; for short occupation, one;

one; not value, two; and another rejection upon some other ground. In April 1835 the number of claimants was 814. Of them 199 were registered; rejected, 80; for short occupation, four; not value, nine; on miscellaneous grounds, 67. I may explain, in reference to this session, that the number of claimants is large. It occurred shortly after the general election of January 1835, and both parties had been in their canvasses, stirring up the parties who were unregistered, which led to a large number of claims. The rejections were numerous at that session; and I may explain it by stating, that it was at that session that the question was raised relative to the right of persons to register who had a portion of their houses set to lodgers. The 67 rejected were, I believe, chiefly on that ground.

1005. Will you be so good as to furnish a statement to the Committee, classifying each of those also?—I will. In July 1835 the claimants were 651; registered, 122; rejected, 27. I have not an analysis of the rejections in July 1835, but I will get it from the list of the clerk of the peace, and lay it before the Committee with the other classification. In October 1835 the claimants were 892. Of them there were registered, 131; rejected, eight; two for short occupation, and two on miscellaneous grounds.

1006. Mr. E. Tennent.] Can you account for the large number registered then, in proportion to the number before?—The number registered is not large in proportion to the number of claimants, but there is a large number of claimants in this case, 892; and the reason for so large a number of claimants was this: an election took place in Belfast about August 1835, at which a question was raised as to the proper registry of a number of the persons who appeared on the list, on the ground that they were registered from a double qualification, as a house and shop. The objection taken was, that they were not registered according to the provisions of the Reform Act.

1007. Chairman.] By a double qualification, do you mean that they possessed two qualifications?—No; the combining of two ingredients of qualification given by the Reform Act in their certificate to make up the franchise. The Reform Act gives the franchise to those who occupy a house, warehouse, counting-house or shop. The objection taken to the certificate of those parties was, that it did not show a registry from any one of those qualifications; that it showed on the face of it a registry not recognised by the Reform Act, namely, one from a house and shop. Those questions having arisen at the election in August 1835, and the assessor having decided against their right to vote, those persons served notice on the clerk of the peace of their intention to register, and to come forward as new claimants.

1008. Mr. O'Connell.] Can you specify at present how many of the 131 were persons whom Mr. O'Dwyer, the assessor, rejected for having a house and shop in their certificates, granted by himself?—I cannot specify accurately the number, but I have a note here, that of the 131 registered in October there were 83 registries; and I believe that the greater number of them were persons who had been registered before, as from a house and shop.

1009. Can you, by looking at any documents in town, make out an accurate list of the persons who were registered upon that account?—I think I can, by referring to the list of the clerk of the peace, and to the names of the persons registered. I cannot say that it will be perfectly accurate, because in so large a number of people there may be two persons of the same name.

1010. Mr. E. Tennent.] At the election to which you referred, Mr. O'Dwyer rejected one voter of that kind, and all the others who were similarly registered conceived their cases to be ruled by the rejection?—As I recollect, there was but one person whose vote was refused on that ground.

1011. Mr. O'Connell.] But of course that one rejection, if persevered in, ruled the case of every similar certificate?—If persevered in.

1012. Mr. E. Tennent.] How would that decision affect the voters on both sides?—There were persons registered on both sides from this questionable qualification. I believe the majority of the registries of that kind applied to the liberal interest or to the radical interest in the town of Belfast; but there were registries of that description on both sides.

1013. Would there have been a very considerable majority?—Not conceiving that to apply to the inquiry in any way, I did not direct my attention to make any calculation upon that subject; but I may state, that having myself always considered the qualification to be bad, in those instances where I have acted in the registry directly I avoided putting in the qualification; and I was exceedingly anxious in

Mr. John Bates.

8 March 1837.

January 1835 that the opinion of the then Attorney-General should be taken upon the question, with a view to raise the question at the election.

1014. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] Would the decision of the question in one way or the other have affected the result of the election?—It might have affected it. To answer the question accurately I would have to know the number who would have voted on each side, which a person cannot do here; but it would operate prejudicially certainly in the first instance to the liberal interest; but if the decision was wrong, the result of a petition must of course bring it to the state in which it ought to have been.

1015. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you conceive that the effect of that decision upon the *prima facie* case would have been such as to decide the election on either side?—No; I am quite satisfied, from my knowledge of the state of parties, that at the election in August 1835, if all those votes had been registered on both sides the result would have been the return of Mr. Dunbar, who is at present the sitting Member; that is my belief, from calculations made at the time for the purposes of the election. I give these results from the calculations our party made. At the same time, being an agent, I may overrate the strength of my party; but from the state of the poll upon the first day, I believe that the liberal party themselves were convinced that they could not carry the election.

1016. Mr. O'Connell.] Having given your opinion as to the ultimate result, can you give any opinion as to the number of voters liable to that objection on the liberal, as contrasted with those of the illiberal side?—My belief is, that the objection applied to a majority of the radical party, and that those of the conservative party who were so registered were less in number; but I cannot take upon me to specify anything near the number to whom the objection would apply, because I did not conceive that the question would be put to me, therefore I have not prepared myself for it.

1017. Shall you be able to make out that account?—There would be a difficulty in making out that return, because it will depend upon the belief that each party had of how the electors who were so registered would vote.

1018. Is there anybody who ought to be able to form a more accurate opinion than you who have been attending all the registries but one session, and who have been agent for one of the parties at each registry since the Reform Act?—I have not been conducting agent, but I have acted as agent; there are persons in all large boroughs such as Belfast who come under the denomination of doubtful votes, and I would find considerable difficulty in classifying them. I am quite sure that if I made out a statement of how it would affect each party, and if the agent on the other side made out a statement, that we would disagree.

1019. What was the majority that decided the election in favour of Mr. M'Cance?—Six.

1020. He was upon the liberal interest?—He was upon the liberal interest, and had a great many personal friends who voted with him, and no man deserved personal friends better than Mr. M'Cance.

1021. And among those was the valuator, Mr. Thompson; did not he give him one vote?—Mr. Thompson gave him one vote.

1022. Was the constituency polled out as close as it could upon the election?—Upon the occasion of Mr. M'Cance's election the constituency was polled out; I would say that more than the constituency was polled; it was the general election of January 1835. There were three candidates; Mr. Emerson Tennent, Lord Arthur Chichester, and Mr. M'Cance. There were several persons polled upon that occasion who had removed out of their places for which they registered, but had got the key of the house a few days before; they got into possession for an hour or two to qualify them to give the vote.

1023. Mr. Emerson Tennent.] What majority had I upon that election?—I have no document with me from which I can state the numbers accurately.

1024. What is your recollection of it?—My recollection is, that it was about 100. I am anxious to correct the answer which I gave with regard to my acting as agent. I did not act as agent at the election in January 1835. I was then serving my apprenticeship to Mr. Arthur, at Belfast. Mr. Arthur was retained as Mr. M'Cance's conducting agent. I had been acting as the agent for Mr. Emerson Tennent; but in consequence of Mr. Arthur having been subsequently engaged as conducting agent for Mr. M'Cance, I removed to Dublin for the purpose of transacting business there for Mr. Arthur.

1025. What do you conceive the probable majority of Mr. Dunbar would have been

been at that election had the constituency been polled out; do you conceive it would have been more or less, or equal to the majority I had upon that occasion?—Mr. Dunbar would have had a larger majority, in my opinion, in January 1835, there being only two candidates in the field, and one member to be elected at that election; but I have not prepared myself with the number, not conceiving that it bore upon this inquiry.

1026. Then your impression from that calculation is, that the decision of the house and shop question could not possibly have decided the election of 1835 in favour of Mr. Dunbar against Mr. Robert Tennent?—If the question is, 'Supposing the persons who were registered from the house and shop were not permitted to vote on either side,' I am not prepared to answer that question accurately. I am prepared to state that there would have been a large majority, the parties registered for the house and shop on each side voting.

1027. *Chairman.*] Supposing the election had gone on after the first day, and the constituency polled out, and all those questionable voters had been admitted on both sides, you still think that Mr. Dunbar would have had a large majority?—Yes.

1028. *Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.*] At the time that decision was made by the assessor, did not you believe that it was the general feeling of different persons at the election that it was a decision extremely injurious to the liberal party?—The general feeling was, that it affected the liberal party to a greater extent than it affected the conservative party.

1029. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Was not the objection made upon the argument of your counsel?—Yes, the objection was taken by the conservative party.

1030. *Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.*] The exact extent to which it would affect one party or the other could not be known except to the agents?—No, scarcely to them, because the objection might apply to doubtful persons, with respect to whom it was not known on what side they would vote.

1031. *Chairman.*] Can you state the whole number of votes that were affected by this decision at the election?—I cannot at present; but I feel it right to add, that while I speak of matters of opinion, my impression, and a tolerably general impression, was, that the decision of the question was merely used as a reason for resigning the contest. The election had proceeded for a part of one day, and during that time several persons had voted for Mr. Dunbar, whose votes, I believe, the other party expected; and I understood that there had been an offer made by the assessor to hear the question re-argued as to whether those persons who registered for a house and shop were entitled to vote or not.

1032. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] In the course of that night the election was over?—I heard, at one o'clock that night, that Mr. Robert James Tennent was about to resign, and I certainly was much surprised when I found that it was put solely on the ground of the decision on the question to which I have referred.

1033. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Were you aware that the question remained over for re-argument on the following day?—I have so understood.

1034. Was it generally understood so?—I do not know whether it was generally understood or not; it might not have been known beyond the agents who were acting on each side.

1035. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] But the agents expected that it would be discussed the following day before the assessor again?—I certainly expected that it would be discussed.

1036. You are aware that Mr. O'Dwyer expressed his readiness to hear it discussed again?—I heard from himself the next day, in the court-house, a statement to that effect, that he had communicated his readiness to hear the question argued by Mr. M'Donnell, who was acting for the liberal party.

1037. Did he state that in open court, in the presence of the parties?—He did, but it was after the resignation. The election had proceeded for one day: in the paper of the morning after, an address appeared from one of the candidates, Mr. Robert James Tennent, in terms at which Mr. O'Dwyer felt considerably hurt, censuring the decision severely. There was a large meeting of the electors at the court-house, and Mr. O'Dwyer then went into an explanation of his views, and of his conduct, having sent for Mr. Robert James Tennent, and, I believe, for Mr. M'Donnell and the agents for all the parties.

1038. And Mr. Robert James Tennent and the agents for both parties being assembled in open court, Mr. O'Dwyer, in the presence of all, stated what his

Mr. John Bates.

8 March 1837.

views were, and what his sentiments had been, and that he had arranged to have it re-argued the next day?—He did.

1039. Did he state his surprise at finding in the course of the night that the resignation had taken place?—His surprise at the terms in which Mr. Robert James Tennent's address was couched, which was the reason why he came forward with this explanation.

1040. Did he state so in the presence of the parties?—He did.

1041. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] When was the case actually argued before Mr. O'Dwyer?—It was argued on the evening of the first day of the polling.

1042. And he then made a decision on that evening?—So I understood; I was acting in the tally-room; I was not in the court-house at the time.

1043. Did he pronounce a judgment at length on the vote?—I do not know.

1044. Mr. Hamilton.] Had you any conversation with any of the agents on the opposite side during the course of that evening, or before Mr. Tennent's resignation, upon the subject of the re-argument of the question upon the following day?—No, I had not.

1045. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Were you rightly understood to say, that from your subsequent examination of the subject you came to the opinion that that point so decided by Mr. O'Dwyer would not have probably decided the election against the liberal party; that it would have affected the voters on both sides to such an extent as not to have altered the result?—It would have affected the voters on both sides; and my own belief is, that the decision of that question, one way or the other, would not have decided the election.

1046. Did you take pains to form a judgment upon that subject; did you examine the bearing of that decision upon the voters on both sides in the interest of both parties?—At the time I did make some calculations upon the subject; but I have made no calculations recently.

1047. But the opinion you give is not a mere guess, but founded upon calculations that were made at the time?—It is founded upon calculations made at the time; and my conviction is, that, admitting the persons registered for house and shop to vote on both sides, Mr. Dunbar would have been returned by a large majority; I have no doubt of that; and I do believe that the impression that such would be the case was the reason why the resignation took place, rather than adopting the course of tendering the votes and petitioning the House of Commons that those persons who were rejected should be placed upon the poll.

1048. Then is it your own impression that the friends of Mr. Robert James Tennent availed themselves of that decision for the purpose of riding off with some degree of *clat* from the contest?—I do believe it; and it was the general belief among all our party; and I think some of their own party suspected the matter too.

1049. Chairman.] Can you give the numbers registered, previously to August 1835, out of the questionable qualification of house and shop, and by whom they were registered?—I can, by referring to the books of the clerk of the peace.

1050. Can you also give the number upon the liberal and on the conservative side, and of those whose politics were unknown, so far as your information extends?—I will endeavour to make out such a list, as accurately as I can, from the books I have here.

1051. Can you further state the number who are registered, in consequence of the decision of the assessor upon that occasion?—I can.

[The Witness was directed to prepare the said Returns.]

1052. Mr. O'Connell.] During those sessions of which you have been speaking, it has been the habit of both parties to attend by agents?—Yes, with the exception of January 1833, by agents or counsel.

1053. And sometimes by both?—And sometimes by both.

1054. On your side, have you had agents and counsel at every session?—No.

1055. At how many have you only had agents?—I must answer that question from recollection only, as I have no documents that will assist me; but, as well as I recollect, we had only agents in April 1833, July 1833, October 1833, and I think one or two sessions in the beginning of 1834.

1056. Were there agents on both sides at all those sessions?—Yes.

1057. Were there counsel on the other side on those occasions?—As far as my recollection

recollection enables me to speak, there were; but the information that I can give the Committee of this subject just now is of very little value, because it is from a very remote recollection, as far as regards the other party; but I am sure that at every registry, with the exception of January 1833, there were either counsel or agents on both sides.

1058. And more than one counsel occasionally?—More than one counsel occasionally on the liberal side, but never more than one counsel on the conservative side; and there were no counsel until some part of Mr. Mayne's time and Mr. Fogarty's time. I wish to state, in reference to a question that was put to me before us to the state of the parties at Mr. M'Cance's election (it refers to the mode of making out this return), there were many parties voted for Mr. M'Cance and Mr. Tennent jointly; the difficulty would be in classifying them. Those parties generally voted against Lord Arthur Chichester at that time, in consequence of the state of some private matters in reference to the family; to which private matters was attributed the loss of the election, as far as Lord Arthur Chichester was concerned.

1059. *Chairman.*] Might not private reasons induce persons to vote for Mr. Emerson Tennent?—No doubt of it.

1060. Mr. *O'Connell.*] Whose opinions were liberal?—There were some persons whose opinions were liberal who voted for Mr. Emerson Tennent from private regard.

1061. *Chairman.*] Will you proceed to state what took place at the next registering sessions after October 1835?—In January 1836, the number of applicants was 815; of those there were registered 267; rejected, 16; three of them for want of value and thirteen on miscellaneous grounds.

1062. Who was the registering barrister at that time?—Mr. Fogarty; that was his first sessions. In April 1836, the total number of applicants was 673; registered, 161; rejected, 22; eight for short occupation, two not value, and 12 on miscellaneous grounds. In July 1836, applicants, 672; registered, 90; rejected, 13; one for short occupation, two not value, and 10 on miscellaneous grounds. In October 1836, the total number of applicants was 651; registered, 191; rejected, 26; one for short occupation, one not value, and 24 on miscellaneous grounds. In January 1837, applicants, 772; registered, 226; rejected, 22; for short occupation, five; not value, six; and on miscellaneous grounds, seven. I wish to state that there may be some small errors in this calculation, but it is made out as accurately as possible from the list of the clerk of the peace and documents in my own possession.

1063. Mr. *Emerson Tennent.*] You have stated that you attended as an agent during the registry sessions of Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry and Mr. Mayne. Can you state what the practice of Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry and Mr. Mayne was as to the length of occupation required by Act of Parliament?—Mr. O'Dwyer and Mr. Mayne required that the applicant should have been in the actual occupation or in the actual use of the house, warehouse, counting-house or shop out of which he sought to register, for six months previous to his appearing before him to claim the franchise. In the case of a dwelling-house, he required that the party should either by himself or his family have resided in it. If a warehouse, that he should have his goods stowed in it. If a shop, that he should be selling goods in his shop, using it for the purposes of his business. If a counting-house, that he should be transacting his business and keeping his accounts in it for that period.

1064. With regard to the length of occupation required by the Act of Parliament, can you remember the principle laid down by Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry and Mr. Mayne?—I think I have stated they required a six months' occupation before they would admit the party to the enjoyment of the franchise.

1065. And instances of rejection have occurred in consequence of a shorter occupation than six months?—Several rejections have occurred on that ground. I recollect myself, in reference to Mr. Mayne, a decision of his in the case of a Mr. Isaac Hardy, who had resided in Henry-street, in Belfast; he had had the legal possession of the premises more than six months, but he claimed to register out of it as a dwelling-house, and his family had not resided in it for full six months previous to the time of his applying; he was a few days short of the six months, and Mr. Mayne's opinion on that occasion was, that it required a full six months' actual occupation by residence, and he rejected the applicant.

1066. In that instance, Mr. Hardy not having been in six months' actual occupation, he was rejected by Mr. Mayne?—Yes.

Philip Fogarty, Esq., called in; and Examined.

- P. Fogarty, Esq.* 1067. *Chairman.*] WHAT are you?—An Irish barrister; an assistant barrister for the county of Antrim.
 8 March 1837. 1068. As such assistant barrister for the county of Antrim, have you presided at several registry sessions?—I have presided at five quarter sessions, at each of which a registry takes place.
 1069. Beginning with which sessions?—Beginning with the sessions that commenced early in January 1836.
 1070. You have presided at all those held during the last year, and at the January sessions of the present year?—I have.

Mr. *John Bates* further Examined; Mr. *Fogarty* remaining present in the room.

- Mr. John Bates and P. Fogarty, Esq.* 1071. HAVING stated what the practice of Mr. O'Dwyer was with regard to the occupation required, can you state, so far as fell under your observation, what Mr. Fogarty's was?—The principle, as to occupation, upon which Mr. Fogarty acted, I believe to be this: If the party had legal possession for six months, he would register the applicant, notwithstanding that his actual occupation or residence in the house had commenced at a more recent period, say two or three months previous to the time of his appearing to claim the franchise. As for instance, if a party had taken a dwelling-house and got the key of it, or had worked in it six months previous to the time of his appearing, although he only went to reside in it within the period of six months, that is, two or three months before, the applicant would be registered.
 1072. *Chairman.*] You mean to state that the doctrine Mr. Fogarty laid down was this, that possession was the main ingredient, and not occupation?—That legal possession for six months satisfied the term "occupation," provided the party had had the actual occupation for any portion of time at all previous to his appearing to claim the franchise.
 1073. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Does any instance occur to you by which you can illustrate this to the Committee?—There are several instances which I will state to the Committee. But before doing so I wish to state to the Committee the source from which I derive my information at present. At the first registry sessions in 1836, when Mr. Fogarty first presided there, there was no reporter for the public press present. On that occasion Mr. Fogarty's decisions as to several questions appeared to those who were attending for the conservative interest as very much opposed to those of his predecessors, and contrary to what had been our views of the Reform Act. Under these circumstances I felt it to be my duty to take a note of those decisions, with a view to ascertain, by subsequent inquiry, their accuracy, and with a view, if they were wrong, by the influence of legal opinions and public opinion generally upon them, to have them set right. For that purpose I took a note of the proceedings. That note I extended into a report of the cases at the registry; and I handed that report to the proprietor of a respectable whig paper in Belfast, with my directions, in case Mr. Fogarty impeached the accuracy of it, to avow to Mr. Fogarty that I was the party who had communicated it.
 1074. Will you state the name of the paper?—The Belfast Commercial Chronicle. I am thus explicit on the subject, in order to apprise the Committee of the source from which I give my information, and that I may be correctly understood when I cite from that report.
 1075. Can you furnish the Committee with a copy of that paper?—I have a copy of another paper, the Belfast Guardian, into which that report was copied; I have not a copy of the Belfast Commercial Chronicle. I may state that Mr. Anderson, the proprietor of the Commercial Chronicle, announced at the same time in his paper that it had been communicated to him, I believe he stated, from a respectable quarter; and I instructed Mr. Anderson to avow me to be the person who prepared that report to Mr. Fogarty, but I am not aware whether the authority was inquired after or not.
 1076. *Mr. O'Connell.*] What is the date of the Belfast paper?—The 12th of January 1836.
 1077. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Then the Committee are to understand that you were present at the registry when you made the original notes?—The original notes were taken by me from Mr. Fogarty's decisions, and those original notes I immediately

diately extended, and this is the report prepared by me with as much accuracy as possible. It certainly does not embrace all that occurred at the registry. It would not have been inserted in the paper if it had, but it embraces the material cases, especially those which apply to any questions then raised for the first time upon which the decisions appeared to us not to be agreeable to the meaning of the Reform Act.

1078. Mr. O'Connell.] What is the date of that newspaper?—The date of the paper from which I give my evidence is Tuesday, January 12th, 1836.

1079. The Belfast Commercial Chronicle is printed on Monday?—The Belfast Commercial Chronicle is printed on Mondays, Wednesdays and Saturdays.

1080. Is that a copy of your first report?—This is a copy of the only report that I ever prepared.

[A paper was shown to the Witness.]

1081. Is that the paper in which it first appeared?—I believe it is.

1082. That is the Belfast Commercial Chronicle of Monday, January 11, 1836?—It is.

1083. Mr. E. Tennent.] Will you proceed to state some of the cases?—The cases which illustrate the evidence that I have given in reference to Mr. Fogarty's decisions, are, first, "Thomas Smith, claimant as a householder, answered the usual questions put by the barrister; had been in possession for six months; paid all taxes; house was of the value of 10*l.* a year. Cross-examined by Mr. Whiteside: Q. When did you get possession of your house?—A. In the end of June last. Q. When did you go into actual occupation?—A. Put his furniture into the house between the 14th and 20th of August; thinks he did not sleep in the house until the 20th of August. Mr. Whiteside submitted, that the claimant must be rejected, inasmuch as he had not been in the actual occupation of the house for six months last past. Legal possession, by the statute, was evidently contradistinguished from actual possession. A man might be in legal possession of 20 houses in 20 different places; but it was impossible for him to be in actual occupation of a house in which he did not reside, or inhabit by himself or his family. The barrister was of opinion, that legal possession satisfied the statute, and accordingly admitted the vote." The next case is that of "David Davison, esquire; claimed to register out of his house in Howard-street. In reply to the usual questions put by the barrister, stated that he had commenced paying rent on the 1st of May last; that it was a new house, and not habitable at the time he took it; that he had been in possession since that time, having had workmen therein repairing it for occupation, but did not actually inhabit it till the latter end of October. The barrister said, that, under the state of circumstances, he was of opinion that the claimant was entitled to register. Mr. Davison said, that although he was satisfied he had been in legal possession for the last six months, he could not take the oath that he had been in the 'actual occupation' for that period. The barrister observed, he was of opinion that actual occupation might be by servants, or locking up the house. Mr. Davison said, that if the barrister would expunge from the affidavit the words 'actual occupation,' he could take the oath, but not otherwise. The barrister was surprised at such scruples from a legal gentleman, after the explanation he had given, and remarked, that oaths were to be taken in the sense in which they were administered. Mr. Whiteside said he would venture to controvert this doctrine, as he conceived the oath was to be taken in the sense in which it was understood by the person whose conscience was to be affected thereby. Mr. Nelson said, that if the applicant declined to take the oath, there was an end to discussion on the subject. Mr. Davison refused to take the oath of 'actual occupation.'"

1084. Mr. O'Connell.] What is Mr. Davison?—He is an attorney.

1085. Is he a liberal?—He is a conservative.

1086. A decided conservative?—He is a conservative; I hope he is decided.

1087. Is he brother to the Mr. Davison who conducts the Ulster Times? Is he himself a proprietor of the Ulster Times?—No; there is a brother of his, Mr. George Davison, who I believe is one of the proprietors of the Ulster Times.

1088. Is there a stronger conservative paper in the north than the Ulster Times?—It is a very decided conservative paper.

1089. Is not it the strongest in the north?—I believe there are two or three others; there is it, and the Londonderry Sentinel, and a few others; not many. I believe it is amongst the most decided.

Mr. John Bates
and
P. Fogarty, Esq.
8 March 1837.

1090. Do you know any so decided?—I know none more decided; but I believe the Londonderry Sentinel is as decided a conservative paper as it.

1091. You have no doubt of Mr. David Davison being a conservative?—No.

1092. Perhaps he might have been even an Orangeman?—I do not know whether he was an Orangeman or not.

1093. You are not one yourself?—No.

1094. Is David Davison's brother a partner with him?—He has a brother who is partner with him.

1095. Did he ever attend as agent at either election?—He formerly attended as agent at the registry, previous to Mr. Fogarty's coming to Belfast, during a portion of Mr. Mayne's time; and he is generally connected with the elections in Belfast.

1096. For the conservative side?—Yes.

1097. And a partner with his brother?—Yes.

1098. Then you can have no doubt that Mr. David Davison would vote in the conservative interest, if he had a right to do it?—No, I cannot have a doubt about it.

1099. Have not you heard him speak in the conservative interest?—No, I have not.

1100. His partner you have?—Yes, his partner speaks.

1101. At public meetings?—Yes. The other case is that of "Robert Magee, claimed to register out of a dwelling-house in Gloucester-street, and answered the usual questions. It appeared on cross-examination, that although he had received possession of the house six months since, he had not resided in it for all that time. The barrister held that the applicant was entitled to be registered, and, in reply to an argument in opposition to the claim, observed, that if a person took a warehouse, and had possession of the same for six months, intending to use it as such, although he might only put goods into it the day before he applied to register, he would admit him."

1102. Did anybody oppose Robert Magee?—I believe Robert Magee was brought forward on the conservative interest.

1103. By you?—Yes.

1104. Mr. Fogarty registered him?—He did.

1105. Then he applied this rule to the conservatives as well as the liberals?—Most unquestionably; but while I state that, I am bound to add that the conservatives opposed the principle by every means in their power, as far as argument went, with Mr. Fogarty. They considered the principle an objectionable one, and they opposed it strongly; but some of the persons for whom I gave notice came forward and registered under it, and Mr. Fogarty applied the same principle to them.

1106. As fully as he did to the others?—Decidedly.

1107. Are you aware that Mr. Bianconi has been registered as for actual occupation by the assistant barristers in no less than seven or eight boroughs in Ireland?—I am not aware; I never heard the report before.

1108. Mr. Emerson Tennent.] Are not you aware that persons being registered for Belfast are likewise registered for Carrickfergus?—Yes; there may be persons resident in Belfast who are registered in Carrickfergus as leaseholders or freeholders.

1109. Are you aware of the case of Mr. Cowan, of Carrickfergus, who is registered out of an office or counting-house in Belfast?—Yes.

1110. Cannot you conceive of that gentleman having an office or a warehouse in another place?—I can, certainly; Mr. Cowan occupies a warehouse in Belfast, while he resides in Carrickfergus.

1111. Would you conceive that it came within the intention of the law that a man should be registered in seven boroughs out of a residence in each?—Certainly not as for a dwelling-house; but I can readily conceive that a man may be registered for a warehouse in several places, for a shop in several places, and for a counting-house in more places than one.

1112. Have you any recollection of a case in which Mr. Fogarty was requested to reject a claimant, against whom the objection of short occupation was urged, for the purpose of having the opinions of the judges upon an appeal, and when he declined to do so?—At the April sessions in 1836 James Greer Bell, of Belfast, claimed to register. It appeared, upon examination, that he got the key on the 19th of September, but that he did not reside till November, which would not make it

it six months' actual residence. On that occasion Mr. Whiteside, who appeared for the conservative interest, argued the question fully; he came prepared with the law authorities which applied to the subject, and cited them. He applied to Mr. Fogarty to reject the applicant for the purpose of taking the opinion of the judge of assize, and ultimately, if the judge of assize should think fit, of the twelve judges, upon Mr. Fogarty's views as to the occupation question. Mr. Fogarty declined to reject Mr. Bell in order to try the question.

1113. Has any instance subsequently occurred in which a person has been rejected upon that objection?—At the April sessions in 1836, Mr. Fogarty stated that while he would not reject Mr. Bell, if one of the persons who appeared on the conservative interest consented to be rejected, he would let him stand rejected, with a view to take the opinion of the judges upon it. There was no applicant at that sessions, or the July one, that I recollect, to whom the objection applied; at least there was none who was willing to stand rejected; but at the October sessions of 1836, an applicant appeared on the conservative side, the circumstances of whose case involved this question of occupation, and the agents for the conservative party, with the consent of the claimant, proposed that he should be rejected, for the purpose of having the question decided. He was rejected by Mr. Fogarty, and Mr. Fogarty upon that occasion stated that he would prepare an abstract of the case for the judge of assize, with a view to the decision of the case.

1114. Has that appeal been heard?—No; it was intended to prosecute that appeal at the present Antrim assizes. Upon applying, however, to the clerk of the peace to see the order of rejection made on the case, with a view to bring it before the judge, I found that the case was not in the rejection list of that sessions; but on referring to the list used by the clerk of the peace, I observed that a mark of rejection appeared, but the grounds were not stated upon which he was rejected. Under those circumstances, as it was necessary to lay before the judge the order of rejection, that he might decide upon it, I applied to the clerk of the peace, Mr. Darcus, for some record of it to submit to the judge. Mr. Darcus declined to give that to me, and I have since applied by letter to Mr. Fogarty for such an order, to which letter I have received no reply. The Committee will understand that the judge cannot decide the question without the assistant barrister's order of rejection.

1115. Mr. O'Connell? When did you write to Mr. Fogarty?—I wrote on Saturday last, which was the day after I ascertained that it was omitted in the list of the clerk of the peace. It would have been in time to transmit for decision at the present assizes, if Mr. Fogarty had considered it right to give the order. I will read to the Committee the letter which I addressed to Mr. Fogarty upon the occasion:

" Sir,

" 26, Duke-street, Westminster,

4th March 1837.

" As one of the agents acting at the Belfast registry, permit me to call your attention to the following circumstance:—It will be in your recollection that at the last October sessions the electors for whom I am professionally concerned availed themselves of an offer of yours to take the opinion of the judges on your decision relative to the question of actual occupation, and as the only mode of obtaining such opinion, that John Hannay, of York-street, merchant, the circumstances of whose case would raise the point, was rejected, and gave notice of his intention to appeal. I am instructed to have the case on this appeal brought before the judges on the north-east circuit at the ensuing Antrim assizes. On stating to the clerk of the peace yesterday the appeals which I intend to have argued, I was surprised to find that Mr. Hannay's name is omitted in the rejection list. The fact of his rejection, however, appears on the list of applicants at that sessions used by the clerk of the peace. May I therefore take leave to request you will instruct the clerk of the peace to make such order of rejection on Mr. Hannay's case as will enable the judges to entertain and decide on the appeal.

" I have the honour to be, Sir,

" Your obedient humble servant,

" John Bates."

1116. Then it was the duty of the clerk of the peace to have put that order of rejection from the documents in court upon the regular list?—It was the duty of the clerk of the peace no doubt to record the decision, and I respectfully conceive

Mr. John Bates
and
P. Fogarty, Esq.
8 March 1837.

ceive it was also the duty of the assistant barrister to record his judgment on the case.

1117. He did reject, and that appeared upon the document?—The letter R. appears after the name of the applicant; but the ground of the rejection did not appear on the face of the clerk of the peace's list at all.

1118. Then the clerk of the peace ought to have carried forward the rejection into his list?—I do not know whether it is the clerk of the peace or the assistant barrister that notes the ground of decision; the rejections, I believe, are ultimately signed by both.

1119. It is the duty of the clerk of the peace to mark it?—No doubt, under the instructions of the judge of the court.

1120. Do you mean to pledge yourself that the judge of the court is bound to do any more than to declare his decision at the time, and to sign the certificate of rejection when brought to him?—I do not mean to say that I have anything further than the means of forming my own opinion on the matter; but I would decidedly say, that it is for the judge to instruct the officer what orders he is to make in his court; what order of rejection, for instance, he is to make when a person is refused the franchise. If I recollect right, the Reform Act requires expressly that the assistant barrister shall make such order of rejection in the case as he shall judge right.

1121. Are you aware that the very point has arisen in other counties: for example, in the county of Louth, at Dundalk?—I have heard recently that the question was raised in Louth, but it is only within a day or two that I heard of it. I understand that Mr. Richard Moore, the eminent King's Counsel, who is assistant barrister for the county of Louth, has rejected persons who had such an occupation as that referred to; in fact, who had an occupation such as would have led Mr. Fogarty to admit them; that the party has appealed, and that the case has been argued before the Lord Chief Baron; and that the Lord Chief Baron has reserved the case for the opinion of the 12 judges, deeming it a matter of sufficient importance to take the opinion of the judges upon it.

1122. Did you happen to hear that the first day he decided for the admission, according to Mr. Fogarty's principle?—I did not.

1123. Did you hear that he made any declaration to that effect?—I did not.

1124. Whom did you hear it from?—I heard it from Mr. Whiteside, who is here; that the question had been before the Lord Chief Baron, and that he learnt by a letter which he had that the Lord Chief Baron had reserved it for the opinion of the twelve judges.

1125. Do you mean to say that Mr. Whiteside told you that he learnt it by letter?—Mr. Whiteside did tell me that he learnt it by letter.

1126. Did he tell you that he was in court himself when the Chief Baron pronounced his first opinion upon it?—No.

1127. Did he tell you that he heard the Chief Baron say anything upon it?—He told me that the question had been argued before the Chief Baron, and that he had a letter which informed him that the Chief Baron had reserved it for the opinion of the twelve judges.

1128. Did you ask him whether the Chief Baron intimated any opinion upon it?—I did not.

1129. Did he tell you that the Chief Baron intimated any opinion upon it?—Not that I recollect.

1130. You know Mr. Henry Hutton?—I do.

1131. A respectable gentleman?—Very much so.

1132. Do you know his handwriting?—I do.

[A letter was shown to the Witness.]

1133. Do you believe that to be his handwriting?—It certainly is his handwriting.

1134. You have no doubt that this has been argued before the Chief Baron as a very serious question?—I have heard that the Chief Baron reserved it for the opinion of the judges, and I have no doubt that he considered it of importance.

1135. Mr. E. Tement.] Are you aware that there is another letter in town, which arrived this morning, containing the detailed opinion of the Chief Baron, quite in contradiction to that just shown to you?—I believe Mr. Whiteside's information was communicated to me from a letter which he had.

1136. Mr. O'Connell.] Will you look at that paper. Is that Mr. Hutton's handwriting—(Another letter being shown to the Witness)?—I do not recollect seeing Mr. Hutton write, but I have no doubt in the world that this is his writing, because I have seen opinions of his.

1137. (Chairman.) What is the section of the Reform Act under which you conceive it is the duty of the assistant barrister to record the reasons of rejection?—It is the 21st section, which says, "That in case it shall appear to such barrister or chairman that any person claiming to be registered as a voter for any county, city, town or borough, is not entitled so to be registered, such barrister or chairman shall refuse to permit such persons to be registered, and shall make an order accordingly; and when such refusal shall be on the ground of insufficiency of value, the order of refusal shall state such insufficiency as the ground of such order, or otherwise shall state the objection by reason whereof the claimant has been adjudged not to be entitled to be registered."

1138. According to that last sentence, do you conceive that, under that sanction, the revising barrister ought to state his grounds of rejection?—I do. The 25th section requires, "That where any person against whose claim to register as a voter at elections for any county, city, or town or place, any order shall be made by the assistant barrister or chairman on any other ground than insufficiency of value, shall consider himself aggrieved by such order, it shall be lawful for such person to appeal from such order to the judges of assize at the next assizes to be holden for the same county, city, town or place, and such judges of assize, or one of them, shall have power, on motion, to review such order, and either to affirm or reverse the same as shall be fit, and thereupon to adjudicate, and which adjudication shall have the same effect to all intents and purposes as if the said adjudication had been made by such assistant barrister or chairman at the sessions aforesaid."

1139. Mr. Lefroy.] Was not the consent to be rejected founded upon the arrangement that an order was to be made which would enable the party to try the question before the judge of assize?—Certainly. An offer had been made by Mr. Fogarty, that if an applicant on the conservative side consented to be rejected, he would let him stand rejected; and this offer having been made by Mr. Hanway, the claimant to whom I have referred, Mr. Fogarty stated that he would prepare an abstract of the case to enable the judges to decide upon it, which I understood to be in addition to the ordinary order of adjudication.

1140. Mr. O'Connell.] Did not Mr. Fogarty state distinctly the ground upon which he rejected him, namely, the question of possession; was not that which was consented to that the rejection should be upon the question of possession?—Decidedly that was the object of the rejection.

1141. And so distinctly understood in court at the time?—Distinctly.

1142. Mr. Lefroy.] But he stated that he would make an abstract of the case, specifying the ground of objection, so as to enable the party to take the opinion of the judge upon it?—So as to enable the judge to decide upon the question. It was understood, in addition to that, that it would appear in the list of rejections. Not having appeared there, I conceived that we could take the opinion of the judge upon a separate order signed by the clerk of the peace.

1143. Mr. O'Connell.] Made here in London?—Not made in London, but an order certified in London.

1144. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Is not it the course of proceeding at the registry sessions for the clerk of the peace to have before him a book in which all the particulars are contained as to all those who are registered; to have separate columns for the number of the party, the name of the party, and the species of franchise, and then a column for entering people admitted or rejected, with the cause of rejection?—The clerk of the peace, as I recollect, upon that occasion used a copy of the printed list of applicants, either that or his manuscript copy; he had not a book written out in the way mentioned.

1145. Does not the clerk of the peace keep before him a book in which he enters the number, the name, the species of qualification, and the order made by the court upon it?—I believe that the practice of the clerk of the peace with us is this, that he uses in court the printed list or the original manuscript copy, and he marks upon it the decisions as he goes on, and I believe he always enters up in one book the persons registered, and in another the persons rejected.

1146. Whether it be in a book or upon a paper from which he afterwards posts into the book, is not it the course of proceeding that the clerk of the peace should.

Mr. John Bates
and
P. Fogarty, Esq.
8 March 1837.

Mr. John Bates
and
P. Fogarty, Esq.

8 March 1837.

should enter, when a party is rejected, the grounds of rejection?—Decidedly; and if the decision had appeared in the list of rejections there would be no difficulty now.

1147. Mr. O'Connell.] Will you look at that newspaper, at the case of John Campbell. You have stated that on cross-examination it appeared no part of the house was held entirely by himself, but all set to nightly lodgers. Are you aware that you are mistaken in that statement?—I am not aware.

1148. Did you mean by that that he himself did not occupy any part of the house?—I meant by that that nightly lodgers occupied, from time to time, the whole of the house in one day or another.

1149. You do not mean now to convey that nightly lodgers at any one time occupied all?—I take the meaning of this to be, that no part of the house was in his own exclusive possession, but that all was occasionally occupied by nightly lodgers.

Jovis, 9^o die Martii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Lord Granville Somerset.
Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.
Mr. Lefroy.
Mr. O'Connell.
Mr. Hamilton.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.
Mr. Serjeant Jackson.
Mr. Emerson Tennent.
Mr. Morgan John O'Connell.
Mr. Milnes Gaskell.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. John Bates, called in; and further Examined.

Mr. John Bates.
9 March 1837.

1150. Mr. E. Tement.] HAVE you been able to produce the document which the Committee requested yesterday?—Since I was before the Committee yesterday, I have looked into the books and the papers that I have with me here, and I will be able, with the assistance of the list of the clerk of the peace, to make out the classification of the rejections which the Committee required from me; but I cannot make out the numbers in reference to the house and shop question, or the classification of those numbers into parties, until I have access to documents which are in Belfast. Not considering that the Committee would make any inquiries of me with regard to that question, I did not prepare myself. The poll-books and other documents are not here; the book of the clerk of the peace, which is here, shows the registers on that ground in 1832; but between that period and the election in August 1835, several of the persons who were registered removed out of their houses or died, so that their qualifications ceased; and I therefore could not, without access to those documents which are in Belfast, ascertain how many persons were entitled to vote at the election in August 1835, who were affected by the defective registry in question, nor the parties to which they belong.

1151. When do you expect to be able to give the return?—On my return to Belfast I can obtain those documents; and if the Committee desire it, I will transmit a return to the Chairman of the Committee.

1152. The evidence which you gave the Committee yesterday referred to the principle which had been acted upon by Mr. Fogarty, with regard to occupation; what consequences appear to you to result from that principle as to the creation of fictitious voters?—As regards the question of length of occupation, which was the one upon which I was examined, I would say that, in my opinion, the Reform Act requires a six months' actual occupation previous to the registry; that the oath the claimant has to take, to the effect that he has been in possession and actual occupation for six months, supports this view; and further, that the party requires to be registered six months before voting. Those provisions, in my opinion, were intended to prevent the evil of occasionality, which it has, I believe, been the object of Parliament to prevent as much as possible. And in registering parties who have not had an actual residence, or been in the actual use of the thing out of which they are registered for six months, I conceive that in such cases

a fictitious

a fictitious vote is placed upon the registry, which vote may have a considerable influence upon a contested election.

1153. Mr. O'Connell.] That is your opinion in point of law?—That is my opinion, as far as I am capable of forming a legal opinion.

1154. You know that no man can vote until he has been six months upon the registry?—I do.

1155. You know that the right of occupation, whether there be in your view of the law or not an actual occupation, the right of occupation in those cases existed for six months before the registry?—Yes; Mr. Fogarty required that the right to occupy should exist. That is, the parties having a legal possession, may conceive they were entitled to occupy.

1156. Did he not require actual possession to be given six months before the registry?—He required that the party should have had the key of the place, or should have had the possession by means of workmen in the house.

1157. That is, that he should have an ownership during the six months, however he might enjoy that ownership?—As to how far a party has the ownership who has the key of the house, I am not prepared to say in point of law.

1158. Mr. O'Connell.] I am rather surprised at that when you give so distinct an opinion upon the Act of Parliament?—My opinion with regard to the Act of Parliament is derived from reading it; but it is not so easy to form an opinion upon a constructive question of law.

1159. Now, do not you think then, with your legal knowledge, that a man who has the key of the house, has the ownership of it, can go in and come out when he pleases, can let in and let out everybody he chooses, cannot he?—He certainly can; by having the key, he can go in and out when he pleases.

1160. And let anybody he chooses in or out?—Yes.

1161. Now did not Mr. Fogarty require that the tenancy should be six months in existence before the registry?—There was no question raised as to when the tenancy should commence. My recollection of Mr. Fogarty's decisions is, that he dated the six months from the period at which the legal possession by obtaining the key, or the occupation by workmen, had commenced.

1162. Then can you very accurately distinguish between tenancy and legal possession; what is your distinction now I should be glad to know?—The distinction between tenancy and legal occupation? A person may have legal possession who is not tenant; an owner may have legal possession. I do not understand distinctly the question that the honourable Member puts, with regard to what distinction he wants to direct my attention to.

1163. What is your distinction between tenancy and legal possession?—I am not prepared to state the distinctions between tenancy and legal possession, unless my attention is directed to some particular question, upon which I will be able to give my opinion as to whether a tenancy did exist, and a legal possession did not exist.

1164. In short, you cannot make the distinction unless it is made for you, by pointing your attention to it, is not that it?—If the question is put to me in a shape in which my attention is called to a state of facts, I will then be able to express, or endeavour to express, an opinion to the Committee as to whether there is any difference between a tenancy in such a case and legal possession.

1165. Now did you not yourself say that he required legal possession?—I did.

1166. Did I not ask you whether he did not require tenancy for the six months?—If tenancy is to be taken from the period at which the party gets legal possession, he did require tenancy for that period.

1167. Then can you make any distinction between that legal possession and the tenancy?—No, I am not prepared to make any distinction at present.

1168. Then you have already said that this decision, be it right or wrong, was held out perfectly equal to all parties?—I do think that it was Mr. Fogarty's intention to act upon that principle equally to both parties; but I consider that departing from the principle of requiring an actual residence, or actual use, for six months, gets into such a state of uncertainty with regard to the tenancy of parties, as may lead, and will lead, assistant barristers into cases which cannot be very easily decided; and in those cases I consider that there is a field afforded for a barrister unintentionally leaning to his particular opinions.

1169. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Now, may not a person have legal possession of a tenement without being a tenant at all?—Yes.

Mr. John Bates.

5 March 1837.

1170. A person may have a legal possession as a care-taker, or as a servant, may he not?—I think so; but as to whether the occupation of a care-taker or a servant would be a legal possession in the care-taker or servant I am not competent to form an opinion.

1171. I am not asking any opinion beyond what my question imports at the very first blush of it; you have been interrogated as to the distinction between legal possession and tenancy; I want, if I can, to try whether you have a distinct notion of the distinction between those two things. May not a man be put into the legal possession of a tenement in the character of a care-taker, or in the character of a servant to him who is the owner?—Yes, in my opinion he may.

1172. On the other hand, may not a person be a tenant of any tenement, and not have received legal possession? May not a man have got a lease, for example, of a tenement, and not yet have had his right clothed with possession?—Yes.

1173. Therefore, do not you see very clear distinctions between the two things, legal possession and tenancy?—When put to me in that way, I do; but when called upon to detail those differences before the Committee, it was a matter of difficulty to me.

1174. Now, you are aware of the terms of this Reform Bill in the 5th section of it, as to the right of voting in counties of cities and counties of towns?—I have a recollection of them.

1175. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] I will read it to you. "That in every city or town," &c. &c. (*The honourable Member read the section.*) Do you not see, then, that the Legislature itself, in this Act, in that section of it, takes the distinction between the holding and occupying of premises, and being a tenant?—Yes, I perceive that they do, in reference to the former class of voters mentioned there and the latter class.

1176. Now he pleased to attend to the way in which the Legislature have expressed themselves with regard to the classifications in boroughs: "At all elections for any member," &c. &c. (*The honourable Member read the section applicable to the holding of houses, warehouses, counting-houses and shops.*) Now do not you perceive that in that mere legal possession is not the thing which the Legislature looks to, but the holding or occupying as tenant thereof?—That has always been the opinion that I entertained on the subject, which opinion was strengthened by the views and judgments given by the former registering barristers at Belfast.

1177. Are you enabled now, having had your attention drawn to the provision of the sections applicable to the franchise in counties of cities and the counties of towns and boroughs, to say that there is not only a distinction, but a very substantial one, between legal possession and tenancy?—Yes, I do perceive that distinction. I may mention that my experience has been chiefly in reference to borough registrations; therefore my attention was not particularly directed to the class of voters in counties of cities and counties of towns.

1178. Mr. O'Connell.] What is the distinction you say you perceive?—A party may have the legal possession by his tenants, without having the actual possession, which, I take it, must be by himself.

1179. Then you know the actual occupation must be continuous, must continue during the six months?—It must.

1180. Do you consider that a possession by servants is an occupation of the tenant himself?—I consider a possession by the domestic servant's residence in the house so occupation by the master of that servant.

1181. Though, of course, he may be absent for a month, two months or three months?—Yes.

1182. Or four months?—Or four months.

1183. Or the entire six?—A case has never come under my observation of that description; but it would certainly be my view of the Reform Act, that if there had been a *bona fide* residence, and sleeping and eating by the servants of the master in the house during six months, that it would be an occupation by the master.

1184. Though, as for example in your own case, you might be in Dublin the entire of the six months, while you were occupying your house in Belfast in that manner?—Certainly, if that house was one of my dwelling-places.

1185. So that it may be a dwelling-place without your dwelling in it for a single moment, according to you?—It may be my dwelling-place by the residence of my domestic servants there, and by its being in a state to become at any moment that I choose to go to it my actual and substantial residence for the time.

1186. But

1186. But without your dwelling one moment in it of the six months that follows?—I think, if my domestic servants occupy it, it is an occupation by myself; but, as I stated before, this is a view of the matter that has not before occurred to me.

1187. And without your dwelling one single moment of the six months in it, having the capacity, if you pleased, at any moment to dwell in it, without actually dwelling in it for one moment?—I do conceive that the occupation for six months by my domestic servants, accompanied by their sleeping and eating in the place for six months, would be an occupation under the Act, although I had not resided in it myself or occupied it any portion of the six months; that is my present view of it.

1188. Then the capability of your occupying it would constitute, in that case, your occupation, would it not?—No; I think the fact that my servants were sleeping and eating in it would constitute my occupation.

1189. Well, then; that is, that you could occupy it by means of others, though you did not occupy it yourself?—That I was occupying it substantially at the time by my domestic servants.

1190. That is, by others and not by yourself, is it not?—By my domestic servants.

1191. Why do not you answer my question? that is, by others and not by yourself, is it not?—By others, provided those other persons were my domestic servants, and living and eating and sleeping in the place during the six months.

1192. And not by yourself?—Without my own personal residence in it.

1193. For one moment?—For one moment.

1194. Suppose you had been in residence with your servants for a month, and that you and your servants removed to Dublin, you having locked up the house from all the world until it was your convenience to return to it, would you conceive that to be an occupation within the meaning of the Reform Act?—I believe that question involves law upon which there has been a variety of opinions entertained by barristers, and therefore I do not consider myself competent to give an opinion upon it.

1195. Am I to understand you, that is a point of law upon which you have formed no opinion?—No opinion. No case involving that question has, within my recollection, come under my observation.

1196. Could you say what your opinion would be, if those facts presented themselves to you?—I am not prepared before this Committee, and without preparation, to give an opinion upon it.

1197. Mr. *Hamilton*.] I wish to know whether I am right in understanding you to mean, that the occupation of a house by your domestic servants is, in your opinion, the same thing, in point of law, as dwelling in it yourself?—I believe that, with reference to a dwelling-house, the occupation by my domestic servant is an occupation by myself.

1198. Mr. *E. Tennent*.] You called the attention of the Committee yesterday to the case of Robert Magee; it is contained in that paper (*hauding a newspaper to the Witness*)?—Yes, I have read the case.

1199. Be good enough to read it to the Committee again?—“Robert Magee claimed to register out of a dwelling-house in Gloucester-street, and answered the usual questions. It appeared, on cross-examination, that, although he had received possession of the house six months since, he had not resided in it for all that time. The barrister held that the applicant was entitled to be registered; and, in reply to an argument in opposition to the claim, observed, that if a person took a warehouse, and had possession of the same for six months, intending to use it as such, although he might only put goods into it the day before, if he applied to register he would admit him.”

1200. Now, looking at that section of the Act of Parliament which directs that applicants to register shall hold and occupy tenements of the clear yearly value of 10*l.*, do you conceive that that gives a latitude for actual possession, or for intentional occupation?—Looking at the section of the Act, in connexion with the oath that the applicant is required to take when registered, I conceive that a six months' actual residence in or actual use of the thing out of which he seeks to register is necessary.

1201. Then you would not conceive it a sufficient compliance with the Act of Parliament for a man to take a house, and to obtain legal possession of it, and then to say he intended to occupy it, although he had never done so for six months?—

Mr. John Bates.

9 March 1837.

No, I would not consider him entitled to include in the six months that portion of time which had elapsed during which he had the key of the place, but during which he had, neither by himself nor his domestic servants, resided in it.

1202. Then you do not consider that the doctrine laid down by the barrister there, of a tenant intending to occupy, would warrant his taking these words of the affidavit, "I do swear that I am and have been, for six calendar months last past, in the possession and actual occupation of the house and warehouse of which I seek a register"?—I humbly conceive it would not warrant the barrister taking the view of it that he does.

1203. Mr. O'Connell.] Suppose a man puts goods into a warehouse, you consider then that he is in the occupation of that warehouse?—As soon as he puts goods into the warehouse I consider he is occupying that warehouse.

1204. But until he has put goods into it, you do not consider him as occupying it?—I do not consider him as actually occupying it.

1205. Well, then, if he takes the goods out of the warehouse, though he keeps the key, and though it is his as owner, you do not consider that he occupies it, do you?—Does the question imply the removal of all the goods in the warehouse?

1206. Yes?—And leaving it quite empty?

1207. Yes?—As to whether that would be an interruption of his actual occupation, I am not prepared to say: I have not met with any case involving that question.

1208. Then suppose this case: Suppose that in the month of May a man occupied, according to your idea, and had goods in his warehouse, and that before the 1st of June he sold out all those goods, the warehouse continued his, the key continued in his possession, nobody else interfered with it; would you consider that that man ought to be rejected in the ensuing January?—I have already stated my inability to form an opinion upon that subject, no question of that kind having come before me, and it being one perfectly distinct, in my opinion, from that upon which I have been giving my opinion to the Committee.

1209. So that you think there must be some user of the warehouse?—I do think that the party is only entitled to calculate the length of his occupation from the commencement of his actually using the warehouse.

1210. But you are not able to say that ceasing to use is, in your opinion, ceasing to occupy?—I am not prepared to say whether, under the novel circumstances of a person having removed out of his warehouse all his goods without discontinuing his business, and without the intention to put other goods into that warehouse in the course of his trade—I am not prepared to say that that would be a discontinuance of his actual occupation.

1211. But suppose he has the intention to put goods into the warehouse, but does not actually put them, would that make any difference, in your opinion, as to occupation?—I do not know whether it would or not, there having been a previous actual occupation of the warehouse; and it is therefore that I am unable to take upon me to give an opinion in reply to the question.

1212. Why then did you introduce as an ingredient the intention to occupy, if you think it immaterial?—Just to explain why I am not able to give an opinion upon this question now put to me for the first time, and for the first time brought under my consideration.

1213. Now as to this question of the nature of the occupation, it is one in doubt actually reserved at the present moment, as you have been informed, for the consideration of the twelve judges?—I am informed that a question on occupation has been reserved for the opinion of the twelve judges, but whether it involves the precise question to which I have been examined, I am not able to state.

1214. What question have you been informed, state it distinctly, has been referred for the consideration of the twelve judges?—Some question with reference to occupation, but I do not know the circumstances of the case, and not knowing the circumstances of that case, I cannot state whether it involves the same circumstances as the cases to which I refer, and the registry of which was opposed in Belfast.

1215. It was Mr. Whiteside told you?—It was.

1216. He was your counsel at the session, of which the report is there published that you alluded to?—He was.

1217. Had you not the curiosity to ask him how that question bore upon this list

that you were to give evidence about it?—I had a conversation with him on the subject; but I did not ascertain the facts of the case, and as well as I understood them there was some difference between the cases, but what that difference was I am not prepared to state to the Committee. I think the question before the Chief Baron was, as to whether the party who occupied was a labourer or the domiciled servant of the person who claimed to register; but what other difference there was in the case I do not know.

1218. You have not answered my question; did you ask Mr. Whiteside how far the case before the Chief Baron agreed or differed with this point which you have come here to give evidence upon?—I did not inquire from Mr. Whiteside as to whether the decision of the question before the Chief Baron would amount to a conclusive decision in the cases to which I am referred.

1219. Did you ask him how far it was applicable?—I did not; but I understood from him that it bore upon the case; but whether it was a case so much in point as to amount to a decision of the case with respect to which we complained, I have not ascertained from him, nor am I aware whether he knows or not.

1220. Though you understood from him that it bore upon the case, yet you did not know how far it bore; is that so?—I did not ascertain from him, or inquire from him, whether the decision in it would be conclusive upon such cases as those of which we complained or not.

1221. I did not ask you as to conclusive; I asked you whether, having heard from him that it bore upon the case, you had not the curiosity at least to inquire how far it bore upon the present case?—As to the degree in which it bore upon the present case, I am not prepared to say, because I did not ascertain from him the facts of the Dundalk case: all I ascertained from my conversation with him was, that the applicant had been rejected by Mr. Moore, the assistant harrister, and that the case was before the Chief Baron, and that he had reserved it, and that the case was pretty similar to the one of which we complained; but my impression, from the conversation I had with him, was, that it did not involve all the questions in the occupation case of which we complained; and as Mr. Whiteside himself was to be examined before this Committee, I did not inquire minutely from him those particulars that it would be necessary I should have done to enable me to reply, or to endeavour to reply to the questions that are now put to me.

1222. Mr. *Lefroy*.] I understand you to say, that in order to give a title to register, an actual occupation must be shown, although you are not prepared to say how far ceasing to occupy, or in what degree ceasing to occupy, will defeat a title so acquired?—That is my opinion.

1223. Mr. *O'Connell*.] What day was it that Mr. Whiteside told you of this decision?—I am not sure whether it was on Monday or Tuesday last. I am pretty sure it was on Tuesday last.

1224. Now, as to Robert Magee, that is the person who you told me yesterday was brought forward on the conservative interest?—Yes.

1225. And he was registered?—Yes, he was.

1226. Then in his case Mr. Fogarty applied precisely the same rule to him that he did to the liberal voters?—Yes, he did.

1227. You prepared this report, did you not?—I did.

1228. Before it was published did you submit it to anybody for revision?—I do not recollect that I did. I prepared it from my own notes, and satisfied myself of its accuracy; but whether it was seen by any person before its publication, in addition to the proprietor of the newspaper, I do not recollect.

1229. Could you forget if you had submitted it for revision to anybody?—I certainly would not submit it for revision to any person. I published the report upon my own authority, and I would not submit to any person making revisions in it that would in any degree affect the facts detailed; but whether it was looked over by any person before publication or not, I cannot at present recollect.

1230. Do you think you showed it to anybody, or lent it to anybody, before you published it?—I have no recollection of having done so, and I rather think I did not.

1231. But you will not say positively you did not?—I will not, because my recollection does not enable me to be positive.

1232. Now, in the case of Magee, your report totally omits the party who produced him?—As well as I recollect, the parties who produced the applicants are not stated: the counsel by whom they were opposed and supported generally do appear, but it would have been difficult to embrace those facts with regard to all

Mr. John Bates.

9 March 1837.

the applicants, because it would extend the report to a length that might preclude the insertion of it.

1233. But there is nothing in the report to show that Robert Magee was a conservative?—There is not, nor is there anything in the report further than the name of counsel appearing to show what the politics of any of the parties are.

1234. You know you stated the cross-examination; if you had stated cross-examined by Mr. Nelson, everybody in Belfast would have known he was not a conservative voter?—Yes; they would have a pretty good guess from Mr. Nelson's opposing him that he was not a conservative voter.

1235. And the contrary when Mr. Whiteside opposed?—Yes.

1236. In most instances of any importance I perceive you do mention counsel? I think that in cases in the same report, previously inserted, involving the same question, I have inserted the names of the barristers, from which it will be seen (I refer now to the case of Smith, and Mr. David Davison) that Mr. Fogarty acted upon the same principle with regard to both parties, and I therefore had no intention, in omitting the name of Mr. Nelson, to lead the public to suppose that Mr. Fogarty acted upon one principle with regard to one party, and upon another principle with regard to the other party.

1237. You had no intention to express that at all?—I could not have that from the circumstance that in the previous part of that report an applicant appears at each side, in which, as well as I recollect now, but I cannot be sure, unless you will permit me to look at that report—

1238. Mr. O'Connell.] Take your own.—The Attorney-general has my report, —(It was handed to the Witness, who, after looking at it, said)—Yes, on looking to it, I perceive that in the previous part of the report to that in which the case of Robert Magee is mentioned, there occurs the case of Thomas Smith, who was opposed on the ground of want of actual occupation by Mr. Whiteside; from which it would be inferred that that man was not a conservative, and he was registered. I find that David Davison appeared on the conservative side, and that Mr. Nelson and Mr. Whiteside are mentioned as taking an interest in that case, which would show that Mr. Davison was a conservative, and the barrister being willing to register Mr. Davison, it will therefore appear from the report that I intended to represent him as disposed to apply the same principle to both parties.

1239. Now it does not appear, does it, that Mr. Nelson opposed David Davison?—I did not state that he had opposed him, but that Mr. Nelson and Mr. Whiteside's names appeared in connexion with the case in such a way as showed that Mr. Davison, who Mr. Fogarty was willing to register, was a conservative.

1240. Nobody opposed Mr. Davison but himself, it appears; look at your report.—No.

1241. Mr. Nelson did not oppose him?—Certainly.

1242. Nobody opposed him?—Nobody opposed him.

1243. The barrister decided he was entitled to register?—He did.

1244. Mr. Davison, who had served a notice to register, came forward, got a decision in his favour, and then declined to take the oath?—Yes, as to actual occupation.

1245. Will you tell me how that was arranged to bring a man forward?—I cannot tell you.

1246. You never heard?—I never heard.

1247. Did it not strike you as rather an extraordinary exhibition; now, did it not?—I cannot say that it did strike me as extraordinary; I certainly will state for myself, that I would not have applied unless I was prepared to take the oath.

1248. Were you any party to the ingenious device of Mr. Davison coming forward to register, and, after having obtained a decision that he was entitled to register, refusing to take the necessary oath.

Mr. E. Tennent objected to the question.

The Witness was directed to withdraw.

The Committee deliberated.

The question was put, "That the question be put to the witness."

The Committee divided, and upon the division the numbers were:

Ayes, 3.

Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.

Mr. O'Connell.

Noes, 5.

Mr. E. Tennent.

Mr. Serjeant Jackson.

Mr. Hamilton.

Mr. Lefroy.

Mr. Milnes Gaskell.

The Witness was called in; and his Examination resumed.

1249. Mr. O'Connell.] Did you ever know any person in whose favour the barrister decided that he was entitled to register; did you ever know any such person except Mr. Davison decline to be registered?—Yes.

1250. Who was that?—Persons who were unwilling to swear that their houses were worth 10 *l*.

1251. Can you name any one of them?—I can name James Munce, of Barwick-street. I recollect he paid a rent of 11 *l*. for his house, but he had some conscientious scruples as to whether the house was worth 10 *l*. notwithstanding his paying 11 *l*. for it, and he would not take the oath.

1252. Did not that appear upon his examination in the first instance?—The barrister was satisfied, as I recollect, of the value of the man's house, but he refused to swear to that value himself.

1253. In the first instance?—On the table.

1254. Then there was no decision upon that man's case; he was sent off the table?—The barrister was willing to register him; but of course the only decision that could be upon his case, the applicant having refused to take the oath, was, that he stood rejected.

1255. That is, he paying a rent of 11 *l*., he was examined, in the first instance, as Mr. Davison was, and he would not swear that his house was worth 10 *l*?—He would not.

1256. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you think it was an ingenious device bringing that case up?—No; I think it was the result of a very conscientious scruple.

1257. Mr. O'Connell.] Who produced him?—He was produced by the coöperative party.

1258. Do you know that the case commences with an examination of the individual himself?—Most of the cases at the registry commence and end with that fact; the only thing that occurs is the examination of the individual himself.

1259. You know that in every case in which the man will not swear that his house, in his own judgment, is worth 10 *l*., there is a rejection?—The barrister cannot register him.

1260. And of course there is a rejection?—Yes.

1261. It makes part of the original case?—Yes.

1262. Then Munce did not swear that his house was worth 10 *l*?—No, he would not swear his house was worth 10 *l*.

1263. He was of course rejected?—Of course.

1264. The decision in his case was a decision against him?—It could not be otherwise.

1265. Well, it was so?—Yes.

1266. And could not be otherwise. The decision in Mr. Davison's case was in his favour?—The decision was in Mr. Davison's favour, provided he would take the oath that is necessary to qualify him with respect to the ground of actual occupation.

1267. That is the affidavit of registry?—Yes.

1268. The registering affidavit?—Yes, the householder's oath.

1269. Now in Munce's case he had not arrived at the registering affidavit at all?—In Munce's case the barrister was perfectly satisfied that the man's house was worth 10 *l*., and would have registered, had the applicant been prepared to swear to that fact; but he would not take upon him to do that.

1270. The rent being 11 *l*?—The rent being 11 *l*.

1271. The barrister then asked him on his oath whether it was worth 10 *l*., and he would not swear it was?—The barrister asked him if he were willing to take the oath, the householder's oath of registry.

1272. Until he had refused, there was no decision upon his case, was there?—There was no formal judgment of the barrister upon his case; but I repeat that the barrister was willing to have registered him, in my opinion, from what I observed, in consequence of the rent he paid, if the applicant himself would have taken upon him to swear to the value.

1273. And as he did not, the barrister rejected him?—Yes.

1274. Then no affidavit of registry was tendered to him at all?—I am not sure but it was read to the applicant; I rather think it was; and when he heard the

Mr. John Bates.

9 March 1837.

part of it that referred to the value, I think he objected to take it; but I am not positive of that.

1275. The decision was against him?—The decision was against him, because he would not do what the Act required with regard to taking his affidavit.

1276. The decision was in favour of Mr. Davison?—No, the decision was against Mr. Davison, because he would not take the oath the Act required.

1277. Had not the barrister decided that he was entitled to register?—The barrister had decided that Mr. Davison was entitled to register just in the same way as he had decided that Munce was entitled to register; that is, provided he was prepared to do what was necessary on his own part, namely, the taking of the householder's oath.

1278. Did not the barrister go farther in Davison's case, and actually declare that, in his judgment upon the facts, Mr. Davison was entitled to take that oath?—The barrister did state that, in his opinion, Mr. Davison might take the positive oath.

1279. *Chairman.*] Was it the same barrister in each case?—Yes, in both cases. Mr. Fogarty was the barrister.

1280. *Mr. O'Connell.*] He could not possibly have made a decision in favour of Munce without his having sworn that?—Sworn what?

1281. Sworn to his own opinion of the value?—Certainly not.

1282. Now the facts that Mr. Davison swore to upon the table did, in the judgment of the barrister, give him a title to register?—Yes.

1283. The barrister said that, under the state of circumstances, he was of opinion the claimant was entitled to register?—Yes.

1284. He had said no such thing to Munce?—In Munce's case the barrister would have registered him had he taken the oath as to the value of his house.

1285. He did not say that you, Munce, are entitled to register?—He did not say that Munce ought to swear to the value of his house, nor did he decide that he would register Munce without swearing to the value of his house, because he could not do so.

1286. But he did decide that in his opinion Davison was entitled to register?—He did state that as his opinion on the law with regard to the question of occupation, in which opinion the applicant appeared to differ with him.

1287. Mr. Whiteside gave an explanation of the nature of an oath; do you remember that?—I do.

1288. Do you remember that the assistant barrister thereupon replied, and said what he conceived to be the meaning in which an oath should be taken?—It is in the report; I will refresh my recollection by looking at the report.

1289. *Mr. O'Connell.*] There is not a word of that in it?—I observe, on looking at the report, that the barrister stated that he was surprised at such scruples from a legal gentleman, after the explanation he had given, and remarked that oaths were to be taken in the sense in which they were administered. Mr. Whiteside said he would venture to controvert this doctrine, as he conceived the oath was to be taken in the sense in which it was understood by the person whose conscience was to be affected thereby.

1290. Do you think that the right interpretation?—First, I will reply to the question put to me as to who commenced the observations with regard to the nature of oaths, and my distinct recollection is, that it was Mr. Fogarty who commenced the conversation with regard to the nature of an oath.

1291. What I asked you was, whether Mr. Fogarty did not in answer thereto again to Mr. Whiteside, lay down his opinion as to the sense in which an oath was to be taken?—I have no recollection of his having done so. I recollect what is stated here to have occurred; but my recollection does not at this moment extend beyond what is stated here.

1292. You will not say that that did not happen?—That what did not happen?

1293. After Mr. Whiteside made that observation, will you say that Mr. Fogarty did not reply?—The conversation may have been continued, as to the nature of an oath, after that, but I do not recollect that it was.

1294. Which of the two do you think was right, the man who said that the oath was to be taken in the sense in which it was administered, or the man who said it was to be taken in the meaning of the person who took it? Now, answer that question as a lawyer.—I feel that the question is one more for moralists than lawyers, and therefore I would wish to leave it to moralists to deal with it. I come here to speak to matters of fact and opinion; and certainly I would not

wish

wish to enter into a controversy between Mr. Whiteside and Mr. Fogarty, as to the nature of an oath.

1295. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Do you consider that there was any decision in either Munce's case or Davison's case, until the barrister rejected in each for want of taking the oath?—There could not be any decision until the applicant had done, on his part, what the law required, that is, had taken the oath.

1296. Then do I understand you rightly to say, that there was an intimation of opinion in Davison's case, on the part of the registering barrister, that he would register Davison, provided the necessary oath prescribed by law was taken?—In both cases I understood that the barrister was prepared to register the applicants, provided they had taken the oath which the law prescribed. When I used the word decision in my last answer, I meant no judgment.

1297. You do not consider a judgment given in any of those cases until the whole case is closed, and until the barrister comes to dispose of it one way or other, by the admission or rejection of the voter?—No judgment given certainly.

1298. Did you understand the barrister, in each of those cases, Davison's case and Munce's case, to have given the parties and the hearers generally to understand that he was satisfied of the right to register, provided the parties took the oaths?—Certainly, in both cases I understood Mr. Fogarty would have registered the applicants, if they had taken the oaths.

1299. Although you cannot undertake to state now, at this distance of time, the precise words used by the registering barrister, in either the one case or the other, when intimating his opinion, you have no doubt in your mind he did, in each of the two cases, intimate his readiness to register them when they took the oaths?—I have no doubt of it.

1300. You do not, therefore, mean to convey to this Committee that there was any difference or distinction whatever, in your judgment, between the two cases, in point of adjudication by the barrister?—There was no adjudication in either case; there was an expression of opinion, upon the part of the barrister, as to what was meant by actual occupation in Mr. Davison's case; and there was in Munce's case an evident disposition evinced by the barrister to register him, if he had been prepared to swear to his own opinion as to the value of his house.

1301. Then you do not mean to convey to this Committee that, in your judgment, there was any difference in point of adjudication between the two cases?—No.

1302. Mr. O'Connell.] You say that there was no distinction in the adjudication?—I say that there was not; if I am to mean by adjudication the judgment of the barrister, which I understand to be the meaning of the word adjudication, there was no distinction, because they were both rejected, and both rejected because they would not take the oath which the Act required to entitle them to register.

1303. The barrister did not in the one case in the first instance declare the man entitled to register, and in the other never declared him entitled to register; there was not that distinction?—In Davison's case the barrister expressed an opinion as to the words "actual occupation," and that the claimant might, under the circumstances, take the oath. In Munce's case I do not recollect what expression the barrister used, but I have no doubt on my mind that he evinced the same readiness to register Munce, provided Munce would swear that in his own opinion his house was worth 10*l*.

1304. The only question in Munce's case was the value, was it not?—The only question was, whether the applicant would swear the affidavit, because the value was apparent, as far as rent could be a criterion of value, to every one in court.

1305. But Munce did not consider it a criterion, and therefore the question to Munce was as to the value; if Munce deemed it of value, he would have sworn it?—The question was as to Munce's opinion of the value.

1306. Then the only question was value in that case?—The only question was, whether the applicant would swear to the value.

1307. Then in Mr. Davison's case it was the barrister's opinion that he could swear to the point?—It was; but it was the applicant's opinion he could not.

1308. Is this your report, "David Davison, esq., claimed to register out of a house in Howard-street. In reply to the usual questions put by the barrister, stated that he had commenced paying rent on the 1st of May last; that it was a new house, and not habitable at the time he took it; that he had been in possession

Mr. John Bates,
9 March 1837.

since that time, having had workmen therein preparing it for occupation, but did not actually inhabit it till the latter end of October." Now that is your report of so much?—Yes.

1309. Those statements that you mention there were made upon oath by Mr. Davison?—My recollection is, that he was sworn.

1310. Your report goes on thus, does it not?—"The barrister said, that under the state of circumstances, he was of opinion that the claimant was entitled to register"?—Yes.

1311. It goes on, "Mr. Davison said, that although he was satisfied he had been in legal possession for the last six months, he could not take the oath that he had been in the actual occupation for that period. The barrister observed, he was of opinion that actual occupation might be by servants or locking up the house. Mr. Davison said, that if the barrister would expunge from the affidavit the words 'actual occupation,' he could take the oath, but not otherwise. The barrister was surprised at such scruples from a legal gentleman, after the explanation he had given, and remarked that oaths were to be taken in the sense in which they were administered. Mr. Davison refused to take the oath of actual occupation." That is your report?—That is my report.

1312. Mr. E. Tennent.] With regard to that report, it merely states the assertion of the claimant, and the observations of the barrister. Are you aware whether, after the statement of the claimant, there was a cross-examination or an examination by counsel on either side, so as to lead to additional circumstances not stated in that report?—Counsel on both sides may have asked questions which are not detailed here. But as I recollect, these are the short circumstances of the case; it appeared that the claimant was then in the actual occupation of the place, but the claimant's scruples were as to whether the previous occupation by workmen was an occupation within the meaning of the Act; it is in reference to that, that the barrister expresses that he was of opinion that actual occupation might be by servants or locking up the house.

1313. You have stated that Munce's was not a solitary case; have many others occurred within your experience at Belfast?—Several.

1314. Confined to questions of value, or upon other points likewise?—I do not recollect at this moment any case of a refusal to take the oath, except in reference to the question of value; but there may have been other cases.

1315. You have stated, in reply to some questions put by the honourable Member for Kilkenny, which were repeatedly put, that this principle was not confined to individual claimants of one party, but was applied to both?—Certainly.

1316. Provided this general laxity were persevered in throughout the course of the registry, what political effect do you fancy it would have on the ultimate numbers of those who registered on either side?—In my opinion, it would have an injurious effect upon the conservative interest, because the claimants were not willing to take the oath as to actual occupation; and I, for my part, do not hesitate to state, that I would not swear I was in the actual occupation of a house, unless I had, either by myself or my domestics, resided in it.

1317. But the general effect of these decisions you conceive would be unfavourable to the conservative party in Belfast?—I do. I think the registry of those who would take the oath would take place before those conservatives who would not take it, and that they would be sooner entitled to vote.

1318. Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.] Davison is marked in the report there as an esquire?—He is.

1319. He is a solicitor?—He is a very respectable solicitor.

1320. In extensive practice?—Very.

1321. Has he been concerned in elections, or was he concerned in elections before the occasion on which he went forward to register?—David Davison, I believe, was not concerned in elections. It was his brother, Mr. Richard Davison, who attended to the electioneering or registering department of the house.

1322. His brother?—Yes.

1323. He being a partner with his brother?—Yes, his brother and he are partners.

1324. Do you think that Mr. Davison had never read the oath to be taken by a person going forward to register, under the circumstances in which he was placed, before the time when it was actually put into his hands by the assistant barrister to qualify?—It is difficult to express an opinion as to whether an attorney has read that oath or not. I should expect that the most of attorneys would have read it;

but while I state that, I am bound to add, that David Davison took very little to do; I do not recollect that he took anything to do with the register or electioneering business of the firm; he resided in Dublin chiefly.

1325. Do you think it probable that a man of Mr. Davison's profession and station in life would go forward to claim to register without having examined the Act of Parliament under which he was about to register?—I can only express a belief upon the subject.

1326. I should like to have your belief?—And a very vague one indeed it is. I would certainly suppose that Mr. Davison would have read that Act, but that is merely my belief; and, as I have stated before, David Davison took nothing to do with the electioneering business of the house, as far as I am aware.

1327. Then you do believe Mr. Davison read that oath before he went forward to register?—I think he had seen the Act, and very probably referred to the oath annexed to the Act. That is my belief; but while that is my belief I am bound to add, that at that period I was the party who gave the notice for registry. I did not know what period of time Mr. Davison had been in the occupation of his house. In a large town like Belfast, men will not know those things accurately. A notice was served for him as was usual in those cases; he got a circular requesting him to attend the registry, and in consequence of that circular appeared there. I should suppose it was in consequence of that; I do not know that it was.

1328. Was this the first session at which Mr. Fogarty presided?—Yes, it was.

1329. Now you have stated that Mr. Fogarty applied the rule which he laid down with impartiality to both parties?—I believe he intended to apply it with impartiality to both parties.

1330. You have suggested that the inconvenience arising from his rule to the conservative party was, that his rule was more vague, and that his definition of legal occupation was more vague than your definition of it?—Yes, his definition of it was one that the claimants did not think agreeable to the terms of the oath that they were to take.

1331. But you some time since, in stating in what respect Mr. Fogarty's decision bore upon your party, suggested that the rule he laid down was, in its nature, more vague, and gave more latitude to the assistant barrister to indulge his own political propensities, than the construction that had theretofore been put upon those words?—I believe, from the vagueness of the rule, that a barrister might unintentionally be led to adopt views and to act upon facts that would favour his party.

1332. Then you do think Mr. Fogarty's rule more vague than the opposite construction?—I do, and liable to greater error, for one reason, particularly that in swearing to the possession by having got the key, or workmen being in the house, you have to trust there to the oath of the applicant himself, and he may misrepresent facts for the purpose of acquiring the franchise; and that fact is of such a nature that you cannot contradict him easily. It is not like a question of value where you can meet the swearing.

1333. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] By other evidence?—By other evidence.

1333*. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] You were asked to define legal possession, as distinct from actual occupation, and you stated that you were unable to do so in general terms, but if particular cases were put to you, you could state whether, in your opinion, there was a legal possession, or whether there was any actual possession?—I stated that I would endeavour to do so, as far as my opinion would enable me.

1334. When you made that observation, had you not present to your mind that there was a greater difficulty in defining the term legal possession, than there was in defining the term actual occupation,—in defining them in the abstract?—As a general rule I certainly could understand more distinctly what actual occupation is, from my habits and opportunities, than I could understand what would be meant by a legal possession.

1335. You are a lawyer?—I am an attorney.

1336. You must be aware that the term legal possession is a term perfectly familiar to the law, and that the meaning of it may be ascertained in a variety of legal proceedings?—As to the meaning of the term legal possession, I feel, being an attorney, that the various meanings of that term is more properly the province of a barrister than of a man in my profession.

1337. Is not the question of whether or not there be a legal occupation, a much more familiar question in legal proceedings, a much more ordinary and com-

Mr. John Bates.

9 March 1837.

monly occurring question in legal proceedings, than the question whether there is or is not an actual occupation?—I am not aware which of those questions are of more frequent occurrence. They certainly both occur frequently.

1338. Are you not aware that in all actions of trespass there must be a legal possession, in order to maintain an action of trespass?—There must.

1339. Are you aware, in any department of the law, of any class of action in which actual occupation, as distinct from legal possession, can by possibility arise, except under these Acts of Parliament?—I am not prepared now to mention any case of that description.

1340. From the whole of your experience as a solicitor, have you known any case, save and except under these particular Acts of Parliament, where it became necessary for a lawyer, either sitting upon the bench or practising in court, to form a notion of actual occupation, as distinct from legal possession?—I have not now in my recollection any such case. I believe that those cases have chiefly arisen upon the Reform Act.

1341. Do not you know it is necessary, in a great variety of cases, for a legal tribunal, or the persons practising in it, to have distinct notions of what legal possession is, as distinct from actual occupation?—Yes, certainly.

1342. And not under the Reform Act?—And not under the Reform Act.

1343. Now, taking into your observation the reply you made to my question, do not you now consider that the notion of legal possession is a notion more familiar and more distinct to the mind of a lawyer than the notion or the definition of actual occupation under the Reform Act?—It certainly is a question that comes more frequently under a lawyer's observation; but the terms of the Reform Act I would use as an exception to that rule.

1344. The question is not which construction ought to be adopted with regard to the Reform Act; but whether, adopting the construction that Mr. Fogarty gave to the Reform Act, the notion which the Reform Act would there impart was not one more ordinarily familiar to the minds of lawyers, practising in miscellaneous practice, than the notion which would attach to it, according to your construction, speaking as a lawyer?—Legal occupation certainly comes more under the observation of lawyers than actual occupation.

1345. In the sense in which you put it?—In the sense in which I put it, I conceive that it chiefly rests upon the terms of the Reform Act.

1346. Then, have you any doubt that there must be, in all the lawyer's books, a number of cases establishing what is or is not legal occupation?—I should expect, that in the law authorities there are decisions upon that question, as well as upon most of the other questions that have been mooted.

1347. Questions arising in a variety of shapes?—Questions arising in a variety of shapes.

1348. And not growing out of these Reform Bills at all?—Previously to the Reform Bill.

1349. Actions of trespass and ejectment?—Either previously to the Reform Bill, or not growing out of the Reform Bill; apart from it, there may be many cases with reference to legal occupation in the books.

1350. Then, so far as Mr. Fogarty's rule is to be contemplated in the abstract, it is not more vague than the rule laid down by his predecessor to lawyers?—As to whether the cases to which you refer on the subject have made Mr. Fogarty's rule as distinct as the fact of actual occupation, I cannot state.

1351. You say the facts are more ascertainable with regard to actual occupation than to legal possession?—I state that there is less risk of deception on the part of the applicant.

1352. That is, it will be more easy to feign the facts necessary to support a legal possession than to feign the facts necessary to sustain an actual occupation?—An applicant for registry can feign the facts necessary to support a legal possession with less risk to himself in point of detection, than he could the facts in reference to actual occupation.

1353. Now are you prepared to sustain that with regard to any possible case that can be put?—Why I would put the case—

1354. No, but to all other cases, such as the case the Member for Kilkenny was putting a while ago, where a man got into possession and left it again; absented himself?—The cases that have been put to me, I have answered to the best of my ability,

ability, or confessed my inability to answer them. If any other case is put, I will endeavour to answer it, or to state my inability.

1355. Suppose a man got a lease on the 1st of May, actually delivered to him, and that he by his servant enters into the occupation of a warehouse, but not personally by himself, and the servant so continues six months in that occupation, you would not consider that an actual occupation under the Reform Act by the tenant?—If a party got a lease on the 1st of May, and his clerk or warehouseman entered into the occupation of that warehouse, and put goods there on the 1st of May, I would consider that an occupation by the claimant, such as would entitle him to register.

1356. But if he did not put goods there, but merely entered by his servant?—I would not consider it an occupation until the warehouse was in use either by the claimant himself personally, or by his clerks or servants who would be attached to such an establishment.

1357. Can you state how long it is to be in use; how many days out of the six months it ought to be in use, in order to clothe a man with the actual occupation?—In my opinion it should be in actual use at a period commencing six months previous to the date on which the applicant appears to claim the franchise.

1358. There must be goods on the premises for the whole six months?—I have not stated that: I state that he should have commenced to use it as a warehouse six months previous to his appearing to claim the franchise.

1359. Suppose he gets a lease on the 1st of May, and on the 2d of May puts goods in, and on the 1st of November he comes forward to register?—Well, suppose he has put goods in on the 2d of May.

1360. One day short of the six months?—Most decidedly I would state as a general principle that he must have six months' occupation, whether that is inclusive of the day of registry or exclusive, I will not answer.

1361. I will give you two days; I will put it on the 30th of April; is that a case in which he would register?—I understand the case put now by the honourable Member to be this: a party gets a lease on the 30th of April, his servant goes into the ware-room, and takes possession of it, but does not use it until the 2d of May.

1362. He uses it, but he does not put goods there; he is there and he gets the key?—My understanding is, that he does not use it as a warehouse by putting goods into it until the 2d May; and the case as put is, that he appears to register on the 1st of November. I would state that, in my opinion, but of course I express it with the humility that becomes me, he would not be entitled to register, not having had six months' actual occupation of that place as a warehouse.

1363. Do not you think that in that case it would be as easy for a man to perjure himself by swearing goods were there a day before as it would be to perjure himself in any case speaking of actual occupation?—In a case put in the way that the one last supposed was, merely involving two or three days' difference, there is no doubt he would have great facility for adding a day to his term. But the case to which I referred was a case where a party gets possession of the key of a dwelling-house, has a workman in it for a day or two repairing the windows, or in some way or other, then comes forward to register, counting an interval of two months of such occupation: I would say the means of deception were greater in that case than in the one that has been just put.

1364. What quantity of goods, with respect to the capacity of the warehouse to contain them, must the actual occupant have in order to give him a legal occupation? Suppose it is a large warehouse, and he has got merely one bale of tea there, do you call that an actual occupation?—If the party were in the tea trade, and he had got any portion of goods in the way of his business into the warehouse, I would consider that an actual occupation.

1365. Then the smallest portion would answer in the way of his trade?—If it were a *bona fide* warehousing of goods for the purpose of his trade, I would say that that would be an occupation which would satisfy the provisions of the Act.

1366. But I want to get the fact from which the court is to infer whether there has been a *bona fide* occupation. Now I ask you again whether there is any limit to the quantity of goods which the occupant must have in the warehouse, in order to give him the legal occupation?—I think that the quantity of goods that the applicant has in the warehouse is not a material ingredient in the case. I would

Mr. John Bates.

9 March 1897.

say that the material fact is whether he is occupying it in the way of his business, and has goods in the way of his business there.

1367. Then any minimum of goods will suffice; a pound of tea in the way of a man's trade as a dealer?—I would have very great doubts if it were only a pound of tea, whether it were not intended as an evasion.

1368. Half a dozen pounds?—As to the quantity, I observed before, I do not think that forms a material ingredient; it is the fact whether the applicant has been warehousing goods in the place in the way of his business; what the quantity is I do not consider material.

1369. That inference you draw from the facts?—Yes.

1370. Are you inquiring whether the facts respecting actual occupation are more liable to be feigned and sworn falsely to than the facts respecting legal possession?—I so understood you.

1371. Then having that in your mind, do you not now see a variety of cases in which it will be just as easy to put a witness upon the table to swear falsely to the facts constituting an actual occupation as it would be to put forward such a witness to swear to facts constituting a legal possession?—I still remain of opinion that there is more room for deception in the one case than the other. The cases put are, I would say, with great respect, extreme cases, and I may add, with regard to the quantity of goods, that I would take the quantity of goods there in connexion with the other facts of the case, in order to satisfy me that there was an honest and a fair use of the place as a warehouse.

1372. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] You spoke of Mr. Davison, and you gave your opinion, or more properly I should say, your guess, as to his having read a particular oath contained in the Act of Parliament; have you had any information from Mr. Davison himself to enable you to form an opinion one way or the other as to his having read that oath?—None, certainly.

1373. Have you any grounds or data whatever upon which to form your judgment or belief as to his having, in point of fact, read that oath before he came upon the table?—No; the only reason from which I form the belief at all is that put in the question, namely, the circumstance of his being an attorney or solicitor.

1374. Have you any doubt upon your mind that there are a great number of attorneys and solicitors whose attention is so much directed to their general practice as attorneys and solicitors, that they really do not read all the Acts of Parliament that pass the Houses of Parliament?—I have no doubt many Acts of Parliament pass which solicitors and attorneys do not read. There are very few of them that I read; and there is not a great taste for that literature, unless a man's business calls him directly to the study of it.

1375. In point of fact, is not the Mr. Davison in question a solicitor, practising chiefly in the equity courts? Is not that his branch of the business of the firm?—His department of the business is attending to the business of the firm in Dublin chiefly; as I stated already, he is seldom in Belfast.

1376. Does he not practice chiefly in equity?—I believe a very large share of his business is in the equity courts.

1377. Now I believe a very small portion of the legal business in Dublin, in the law courts of Dublin, not to speak of the equity courts, has reference to the election law, or to the registration law?—I am disposed to think, that if I resided in Dublin, as Mr. Davison does, attending to equity business, that I would not probably have seen the Reform Act, or studied it much; and probably not the oath, unless it became necessary for me to take it. It is in the way of a man's business that he refers to these things.

1378. You were understood to say, that this Mr. Davison was a gentleman who did not take an active part in the registration business of Belfast, or any part in it?—He does not attend to that department of the business; and I have not seen him at any registry session, attending professionally, nor at any election.

1379. Then, as I understand you, you have no knowledge as to Mr. Davison having read this Act of Parliament, nor any ground to lead you to form any belief, or anything beyond a guess, grounded on the single fact embodied in the answer you gave to the honourable Member who put the question?—The circumstance of his being an attorney was the only ground I had for believing it; and its being put to me in point of belief or guess by the honourable Member who put the question.

1380. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] And his going to register his own
vote?—

vote?—The question, as put to me, according to my recollection, was, as to my belief whether Mr. Davison had previously read it.

1381. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Had you any communication from the Mr. Davison in question preparatory to your giving a notice on his behalf to register, directing you to give notice to him?—No.

1381*. Had you any communication with him previously to his being called upon to come up to register with reference to the notice having been served on his behalf?—No personal communication; he got a printed circular like the other applicants, I believe, requesting his attendance at the court-house to be registered.

1382. And are you very sure that he got that?—I cannot be sure of that.

1383. There were circular letters sent to all persons on whose behalf notice had been served?—Yes, by the conservative party, and in the same way by the radical party upon their friends.

1384. Mr. O'Connell.] Whose duty was it to send the circulars from the conservative party?—It was the duty of some of the assistants connected with the conservative party, the clerks or porters.

1385. Whose name was signed to them, do you remember?—No name.

1386. No name mentioned in them except the person to whom they were addressed?—His name was mentioned on the back, but not in the body of it generally.

1387. After the barrister had decided that Mr. Davison was entitled in his opinion to register, do you know whether the affidavit was actually produced to him?—I do not recollect whether it was or not.

1388. Then you cannot say that he did not mention the words without the affidavit being produced?—I cannot say whether he did or did not.

1389. Has he registered since?—No, he has removed out of that house; he has left Belfast as a residence altogether, and resides in Dublin.

1390. He has no residence in Belfast?—No dwelling-house in Belfast.

1391. If he had registered at that time, he would have been a substantial voter?—It is a question of law.

1392. He had a house of the value?—He had a house of the value, but whether he would be a substantial voter in case his vote was questioned, for instance, by a Committee of the House, would depend on the construction of the Act.

1393. He might be a premature voter; there would be no other objection to him excepting his being prematurely registered?—There would be no other objection to him except the one as to the premature registry; but that, if decided against him, like any other objection, would be fatal.

1394. According to the construction put on the Act?—Yes.

1395. If Mr. Fogarty's construction be put upon it, his right to vote would be allowed?—Yes.

1396. If the twelve judges decide the question in the way Mr. Fogarty decided it, then that will be conclusive?—I hope a Committee of the House of Commons will consider it so.

1397. They ought at least?—They ought.

1398. Now, I put it to you distinctly, and I call upon you to recollect the transaction, did not Davison, without the oath being put into his hand, or looking at any affidavit, make the objection for himself, by saying that the words "actual occupation" were in the affidavit, and he would not take it?—I do not recollect how the fact was in reference to that; my impression is, that he had the affidavit, but the impression is so vague, that I do not want the Committee to understand me as expressing it either one way or the other.

1399. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Is it not the usual course of proceeding to put the oath to the witness, or to the party tendering himself to register; is it not the usual course to hand him the affidavit when his examination has been gone through?—When his examination is gone through, the party for whom he appears hands him his affidavit.

1400. I mean in cases of questions of this kind, where the examination is gone through, and the barrister is satisfied upon his general qualification, is it not then the course to hand him the affidavit for the purpose of taking the oath, and completing the whole matter of registry?—Yes.

1401. That is the usual course of proceeding?—Yes.

1402. Now, when any question is raised on the subject, is not the oath then put into his hands, that he may read it himself, and see whether he can take it?—If there is any question raised which involves any fact mentioned in the affidavit

Mr. John Bates.

9 March 1837.

about which the applicant has a difficulty, the oath is generally shown to him, as, for instance, in the case of a person claiming to register who has doubts as to whether he can swear to value. The oath is shown to him in order that he may see the terms in which he swears to value, to ascertain whether he will take it or not.

1403. Then the impression upon your mind is, that in this case, as in others, the oath was put into this gentleman's hand?—That is the impression; but, as I stated before, the impression is so vague, that I do not wish the Committee to understand me as stating the matter either one way or the other.

1404. Mr. O'Connell.] Is not this the practice, that the case is first decided, and then either one party or the other, according as they produce the witness, produces the voter, and hand him his affidavit after the barrister has decided?—The course is this: the applicant appears on being called; the barrister puts certain questions to him to ascertain that he is entitled to the franchise to the satisfaction of the court. If either party opposes him, they offer their opposition; then they cross-examine him; and subsequent to that the barrister either rejects or admits him, and, as the case may be, his affidavit is taken.

1405. Then after the barrister declares an opinion in his favour?—The barrister declares an opinion in his favour, generally speaking, and then the applicant completes his title, as it were, by taking the oath.

1406. Then in general the practice is, that he leaves the table as soon as the barrister has decided in his favour, and goes to his party, whichever it be, to read the affidavit?—Yes, unless some question arises which renders a reference to the oath necessary.

1407. Mr. E. Tennent.] In the case of Mance and other similar cases, where the applicant has a scruple as to taking the oath, was it not the practice to produce the affidavit, put it in his hand for the purpose of being read, and ask him whether he can swear to that?—Yes, either to do that, or read the affidavit to him.

1408. And that is the usual practice in cases of scruples on the part of applicants?—That is the general practice.

1409. Mr. O'Connell.] There was nobody at all to object to Mr. Davison?—No; there was no objection taken to Mr. Davison by the other party, the opposite party.

1410. Chairman.] Was there any discussion before the revising barrister, by the lawyers on either side, upon the proper construction of this point of law?—Yes, a long discussion. Mr. Whiteside, on the part of the party that I was connected with (the conservatives), argued at considerable length, that the applicants so circumstanced should not be registered, and on the other side the counsel for the radical interest argued that they ought to be registered.

1411. This discussion took place in open court before the barrister, did it?—Yes.

1412. Was Mr. Davison present during this discussion?—I do not think he was; I think he came in subsequent to that discussion, but I am not positive as to that.

1413. Then you cannot state whether he heard the argument on either side during that discussion?—I cannot.

1414. But the discussion took a considerable time, did it?—It did; it occupied a considerable time on that occasion, and the discussion was again renewed at the subsequent session, when Mr. Whiteside cited cases in support of his view.

1415. It was renewed, not in regard to Mr. Davison, but in regard to other claimants, upon the same point?—Yes.

1416. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you recollect the question of permissive occupancy being raised before Mr. O'Dwyer in any case?—I do.

1417. Do you remember the case of M'Kean?—Yes.

1418. Do you remember the circumstances of that case under which he claimed?—I do recollect the circumstances.

1419. State them to the Committee?—Mr. M'Kean is the clerk of a bakery company in Belfast; he manages their business, and resides in their house attached to the bakery; he claimed to register out of that house, and he, as well as some other parties similarly circumstanced, were rejected by Mr. O'Dwyer. I have found the decision of the barrister, Mr. O'Dwyer, reported in a case which I know was similar to his. It is reported in the "Northern Whig," of the 15th of November 1832. It was the case of Maurice Cross. "The barrister pronounced his decision on the following day, to the effect that he considered that clerks, warehousemen and managers of mercantile concerns, who receive a salary, and a house free from

rent and taxes, from their employers, are not to be considered tenants, and cannot be distinguished in law from gate-keepers or gardeners, who are allowed to live in a house or cottage, as part of the remuneration for their services. This view of the case be considered as excluding Mr. Cross, and persons similarly situated, from the franchise, although he was satisfied that this gentleman did not occupy a separate dwelling-house, within the meaning of the Act, and was on this latter ground, as well as the other, not qualified to register." In the case of Mr. M'Kean, to which I have referred, it appeared that he had the use of the house as part of the remuneration for his services.

1420. It was a house, or rather apartments in the house, occupied for the general purposes of the bakery?—It was the house attached to the bakery concern.

1421. He was rejected then by Mr. O'Dwyer, in October 1832, I believe?—Yes.

1422. Did he subsequently present himself for registration to Mr. Corry, or to Mr. Mayne?—No.

1423. Did any other applicants, similarly situated, present themselves for registration to these barristers?—There were some applicants, similarly circumstanced, presented themselves, but they were rejected.

1424. Mr. O'Connell.] Can you name any one of them?—Not at present; I cannot name them; but my recollection is, there were persons rejected, on the ground of permissive occupation, by those barristers; and, if necessary, I will be able to state the cases.

1425. And the circumstances?—It would be impossible to recollect the circumstances in many of those cases; but I will endeavour to do it wherever I can.

1426. Mr. E. Terment.] Are you prepared to do so now?—At a future period.

1427. Are you aware whether this man presented himself afterwards to be registered by Mr. Fogarty?—He did.

1428. When?—He presented himself to be registered at the April sessions in 1836.

1429. Had any change of circumstances taken place with regard to his possession or occupancy in the interval?—He stated himself that there had not; he admitted himself that there had not.

1430. And he presented himself to be registered by Mr. Fogarty on the same ground as that upon which he had been rejected by Mr. O'Dwyer?—Under the same state of facts.

1431. Was he registered?—He was.

1432. Was the case argued?—The case was argued at considerable length. I have a distinct recollection, as distinct a recollection as it is possible to have at this date, of each a circumstance; and, in addition to that, I observe a report here in the "Ulster Times," of the 9th of April 1836, of this case. I read that report shortly after its publication, and after the decision, and I believe it to be correct.

1433. You are not the author of that report?—I am not.

1434. Do you know who the author was?—I believe a reporter connected with the "Ulster Times" establishment.

1435. A professional reporter?—Yes. "John M'Kean, Church-street, clerk; has been 12 or 13 years in occupation of his present house; is in employment as clerk in the public bakery; the house he occupies is valued at 10 £. Mr. Whitehead: Applied before to be registered, but was not successful, being rejected; that is two or three years since, and he never appealed or applied to be registered since; the Company could not turn him out at a moment's warning; the house is their property, and he gets it as part of his salary; all the taxes are paid by the Company, and so is the rent; he is engaged for a year, and the renewal of engagement is annually entered in the committee's minute book. Mr. Whiteside submitted that this was a case where the claim must be rejected, as the applicant paid neither rent nor taxes; and that the occupation, being merely accessorial to services, was not the occupation of a tenant. The barrister did not see this. There was the keeper of the British Museum, who was allowed to vote, and the librarian to the Archbishop of Armagh, who were both similarly situated with this applicant, as to rent and taxes. Mr. Whiteside proceeded to instance the case of the clerk to the large distillery at Dundalk, who stood in circumstances even more favourable than this applicant, as his house was quite disconnected from the distillery; and in that case Mr. Moore, the assistant barrister for the county Louth considered the grounds of objection to be so strong that he rejected the case; and an appeal having been made to the judge of assize,

Mr. John Bates.

© March 1837.

the Lord Chief Justice reserved the case for the consideration of the twelve judges, and it was at present waiting their decision. In this case the applicant has not even the exclusive occupation of the house, as the committee retained a room in it for their weekly meetings. The barrister would wish one of the committee to come with the book mentioned, and give evidence. Robert Grimshaw, esquire, attended on behalf of the committee, and being sworn, was examined by the barrister. 'The house is Mr. M'Kean's private house, and the committee have no right to turn him out of it.' Mr. Whiteside read the words of the resolution from the book produced by Mr. Grimshaw, 'that the house be fitted up and given to Mr. M'Kean, for taking charge of the keys, and opening the doors for the bakers.' He (Mr. Grimshaw) was a member of the committee when the agreement was made; thinks that the former man was parted with from having another business, which the committee thought irreconcilable with his duty to them; the house stands upon the bakery concern; the committee meet once a week in a room in that house, and thinks Mr. M'Kean, if he chose, might turn the key and prevent their meeting. Mr. Whiteside contended that he was there simply as the Company's servant during good behaviour, and that by the terms of the contract he was only their doorkeeper. The barrister observed that a grant during good behaviour constituted a freehold. Mr. Whiteside denied that such a resolution as that just read could be construed into the grant of a freehold, and submitted that this was a very important question; as, if this claim were allowed, there were many gentlemen in Belfast, manufacturers, who would immediately send their clerks and foremen who lived on the premises to claim the franchise, and trusted that the case would be allowed to stand over until the decision of the twelve judges was known in the Dundalk case, the more especially as this claimant had been rejected nearly three years ago, and had never appealed to the judge of assize, or applied to be registered at any sessions since. As, therefore, there was a decision in the particular case against this claimant, and a similar case pending before the twelve judges, Mr. Whiteside submitted this claim should be rejected; and as Mr. M'Kean could not under any circumstances vote before the next assizes, he could not be injured by the delay. The barrister would at once follow the course adopted by a gentleman of such attainments as Mr. Moore, if he considered the facts of the case between this and the Dundalk one were the same; but in the former there was no particular stipulation as to time, whereas he must consider in this that there is a title for a year. The meeting once a week of the committee he thought merely permissive, and not affecting the applicant's occupation, and decided that the claim be admitted."

1436. Mr. O'Connell.] Now will you be so good as to state whether Mr. Grimshaw had been examined before Mr. O'Dwyer?—I cannot state that; I do not recollect whether he was or was not; but Mr. Grimshaw was at that period extremely active in electioneering matters, and a good deal in the court-house. I am bound, in referring to Mr. Grimshaw, to say that there is not a more respectable man living than he is.

1437. Chairman.] He was a very active partisan in 1832?—Yes.

1438. And also in 1836?—He was more active in 1832 than he was in 1836.

1439. Mr. O'Connell.] You cannot state whether he was examined or not in 1832?—I cannot; but I believe the facts of the case were ascertained at that period.

1440. I only ask you as to the things that he swore; you have no doubt that he is a magistrate?—He is a magistrate.

1441. A highly respectable gentleman?—A very respectable gentleman.

1442. Incapable of swearing to anything but the truth!—Certainly incapable of swearing to any matter of fact but the truth.

1443. A most faith-worthy gentleman?—Very much so. But while I state that, I am bound to add that in his swearing as to his opinion in a matter which was a matter of law, as to whether the committee could or could not turn Mr. M'Kean out, that of course I would take his swearing in that case as that of a man who was not intimately acquainted with the legal conclusion that ought to be drawn from the facts.

1444. He belonged to this bakery concern?—Yes.

1445. He was chairman of the committee?—I believe he was upon that occasion; he was, I am sure, on many occasions.

1446. He knew all the facts; he had the opportunity of knowing the facts?—The facts were embraced chiefly in the resolution.

1447. Mr.

1447. Mr. E. Tassent.] Then we are to understand from the statement you have given to the Committee, that Mr. Fogarty refused to let this case stand over to await the decision of the judges?—He did.

1448. Did he allow the case to stand over for any portion of time for the purpose of admitting evidence which was not in court when it was first brought on?—He allowed the case to stand over until Mr. Grimshaw and the book were sent for.

1449. Was that the usual practice of the barrister in disputed cases of this kind, to suspend his decision for the admission of fresh evidence?—It was not the usual practice; it was done in some cases, but in other cases it was refused.

1450. Are you aware of similar claims to that of M'Kean having been brought up for registry before Mr. Fogarty?—At the following sessions, in July 1836, what I would consider similar claims were made for the franchise; but the Dundalk case having been in the meantime argued before the judges, and the judges having decided that in that case the claimant was not entitled to register, and this decision having been cited to Mr. Fogarty by Mr. Whiteside, Mr. Fogarty rejected those applicants who appeared in July 1836.

1451. Then it is your conviction, I presume, from that statement, that if M'Kean's case had been allowed to stand over to await the decision of the judges, his vote would have come under the same rule, and been likewise rejected?—It is my belief that the same rule would have applied to him; and I do not see how the application of it to him could have been avoided.

1452. Mr. O'Connell.] You are quite aware, in that registry of M'Kean, that the barrister stated that there was a distinction between M'Kean's case and that before Mr. Moore?—There was a distinction alluded to, which is referred to in the report.

1453. Now there was a certain portion of the salary of M'Kean kept from him by reason of his having this house; he got a lesser salary; that was the evidence?—The remuneration for his services to the Company was made up of a salary, and the use of the house; of course his salary would be less in consequence of having the use of the house.

1454. And if he had not the house, it would be higher?—Yes. I would state that as a general principle. The Company might, however, have an object in keeping their servant there, for the purpose, as is stated in that report, of admitting in their bakers and the persons connected with their establishment; that motive is stated in the resolution entered in the book of the Company, upon which M'Kean's admission was founded.

1455. And M'Kean, if he did not live in that house, of course must have lived in some other, that is very plain?—That, I think, is a plain proposition.

1456. With a higher salary?—Yes, I should suppose the Company would give him a higher salary; at the same time he would get this house, I have no doubt, much less in consequence of the service that is alluded to in that report, of taking care of the house for them.

1457. Now will you state Mr. Grimshaw did not distinctly swear that Mr. M'Kean had had the house for a year, and that they could not turn him out?—Mr. Grimshaw did swear that, and he produced that book to support his swearing, and I have no doubt that Mr. Grimshaw swore what he believed to be the case; but, in my view, the power of the Company to turn him out depended upon the legal construction of that resolution in their book, and not on Mr. Grimshaw's swearing.

1458. And that legal construction was a matter for the barrister to decide upon?—Certainly, and not for Mr. Grimshaw to give a legal meaning to in his swearing.

1459. Was it Mr. Grimshaw's duty to state the facts of the contract?—Yes, it was Mr. Grimshaw's duty to state the facts of the contract.

1460. Do not you think it was his duty also to state what his meaning was as one of the parties to that contract?—As to the extent of Mr. Grimshaw's duty as a witness, I cannot be very particular as to that; but I suspect, in my view, the meaning that Mr. Grimshaw would give to that contract, if the contract gives a meaning to itself, should not bear upon the case.

1461. But was there a written contract between the parties?—There was a book produced.

1462. Was there a written contract signed by either party?—This contract.

Mr. John Bates.

9 March 1837.

1463. Was there a written contract signed by M'Kean?—No written contract signed by M'Kean.

1464. Then what you call the resolution in the book?—The resolution in the book produced on M'Kean's behalf to support his right to the franchise; which resolution, it was stated, had been the basis of the dealing between the parties in reference to that house from the time it was entered into up to the time at which the claimant appeared.

1465. That resolution was the basis of the contract?—That resolution was produced as expressing the terms upon which M'Kean occupied the house.

1466. That the house had been fitted up and given to M'Kean for taking charge of the key and opening the doors to the bakers, and upon that Mr. Grimshaw, upon his oath, expressed his view of the contract with Mr. M'Keon, did not he?—Upon that document Mr. Grimshaw stated that the house was Mr. M'Kean's private house, and the committee had no right to turn him out of it.

1467. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] The appeal from the assistant barrister's decision is to the judge of assize?—Yes.

1468. It only goes before the twelve judges when the judge of assize sees there is peculiar difficulty in the case?—I believe that the general practice is, from the circumstance of the Reform Act being, as it were, new law in Ireland, and there not existing decisions of the judges upon the subject, that it is the habit of the judges to reserve most of the cases for the opinion of the court above, of the twelve judges, unless where the case has been under the review of the twelve judges previously, and decided upon by them.

1469. Mr. O'Connell.] But there is no right of appeal to the twelve judges under the Reform Act at all?—No, the appeal is to the judge of assize; but the habit of the judges in Ireland is, that whenever any subject comes before them upon which they are desirous that there should be an uniformity of practice, and upon which they have not previously expressed an opinion, they reserve it for their brother judges, consider it in their chamber in Dublin, and come to a decision, which decision they generally act upon.

1470. Now do you think that if a judge considered a point a clear one, he would reserve it for the consideration of the twelve judges?—If the point were a new one on the Reform Act, and there had been no previous decision upon it, I believe the judges in Ireland to be so anxious, at least as far as their public acts go, to consult their brethren on the subject, that they do reserve those cases.

1471. Clear cases; recollect my question is, "If a judge considered it a clear case?"—Certainly; a case may come before a judge from an assistant barrister that he will consider so clear a case that he will take upon himself to decide it; it may involve no new principle; there may be doctrine in the books that will enable him to decide it at once; but in a case that involves any new principle upon the Reform Act, or that is in any degree doubtful, I believe their general practice has been to reserve it.

1472. So, then, you do not think that the judge reserving the case for the twelve judges is evidence of his considering it doubtful and important?—I would consider it evidence that the case remained undecided, and that he was anxious, whatever his own view might be upon the subject, to have the opinion of his brethren in reference to it.

1473. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] Do you know anything of the famous Cork case of the non-resident freemen; Baron Pennefather's decision?—I have heard something of it, but I have not read any report of the case.

1474. Do you know that that decision involved the validity on the registry of several hundred votes?—I do not.

1475. Do you know upon that occasion depended the preponderance of one party or another in the city of Cork?—No; I am aware that there was a case with regard to non-resident freemen decided by Baron Pennefather; but, from the distance between my residence at Belfast and Cork, and not having read any report of the case, I do not know what its facts were.

1476. Do you know that the members returned were actually unseated on that very point?—I believe they were.

1477. And the sitting members were seated in their place?—And the other members seated in their place.

1478. Do you know whether the twelve judges afterwards overruled the decision of Baron Pennefather in another case?—I have not heard of their having come to such a decision, but I do not mean to say they have not come to that decision.

1479. Do

1479. Do you know whether the late Sir William Smith overruled it in a case before him?—No. In reference to the question of freemen, I have not had occasion to direct my attention to that, from this circumstance, in Belfast we have no freemen, and but five or six burgesses; so that we have not had occasion to direct our attention to that subject, in reference to the Registry Act.

1480. Mr. O'Connell.] But you have registered all the resident burgesses?—All the resident burgesses were registered. There are very few of them; they were registered at the first registry. I believe there are only three or four; and the non-residents were on that occasion rejected by Mr. O'Dwyer.

1481. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] A great many very nice questions have arisen on the Reform and Register Acts, questions of nice legal distinction, requiring considerable subtlety and knowledge, upon which men may form different opinions?—Certainly; like every other law, there will questions arise.

1482. In both England and Ireland?—I am not aware in England; I have not much knowledge as to the fact in England.

1483. Have you looked into many of the text-books respecting the Reform Act in Ireland?—I have not.

1484. You cannot tell me whether or not that point which Mr. Fogarty decided was one which was discussed and maintained both ways in different text-books before his decision?—I do not know what the text-books state on the subject. I am merely able to state to the Committee the facts in reference to those cases, and the judgments.

1485. You mentioned one reason why the judge of assize reserved for the twelve judges a point which the Act gave power to himself to decide, was to preserve uniformity of decision?—I think that was one of the objects.

1486. Uniformity of decision no doubt is desirable, but the result of their reserving such questions would be that there might not be an uniformity of decision?—Yes; if the judge took on himself to decide points involving any doubt without consulting his brethren, there might be a difference of opinion.

1487. But those points reserved for them are those upon which men, in communicating with each other, might fairly be presumed to come to different conclusions; is that your evidence?—They are cases involving legal doubts.

1488. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You stated your belief that whenever a doubtful case arose, the judge reserved it for the twelve judges; is not that what you stated?—Yes.

1489. Do you happen to know that that doubtful and important case which has been referred to, as decided by Baron Pennefather, was not reserved by him for the twelve judges?—I am not aware what line of conduct Baron Pennefather pursued upon that occasion, but, from what I have heard stated on the subject, I believe he decided that question upon his own judgment. The case there was one that affected the ensuing election; that election was about to take place very soon, and I think it is due to that judge to state that that may have been one reason why he came to an early conclusion, why he acted upon his own judgment, seeing that if the case was held over, the parties might be deprived of their right to vote at the next election.

1490. Mr. O'Connell.] Is not that a pure conjecture of yours?—It is a conjecture certainly, but one arising from the circumstance of its occurring at the first general registry, and the general election being about to take place in January.

1491. Was it not in October that the registry took place?—Yes, the registry took place in October and November.

1492. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did you not state just now that from Belfast being so distant from Cork, and your not having read any report of this decision of Baron Pennefather, that from those two circumstances you were quite ignorant of it?—No; I stated that from those two circumstances I was unable to give an opinion with regard to the effect of Baron Pennefather's opinion on the election.

1493. But however, notwithstanding those two circumstances, the great distance between Belfast and Cork, and your not having read any account in one newspaper or another, you are able to tell the Committee what was Baron Pennefather's motive for not reserving it?—I am not able to tell the Committee any such thing; I merely state that as my supposition of the reason why Baron Pennefather came to a decision in that case without consulting the judges, and I mentioned the only reason I have for coming to that conclusion. If my guess is wrong, or not supported in the opinion of the Committee by the facts I mentioned, it goes for nothing.

Mr. John Bates.

9 March 1837.

1494. But you know that, in point of fact, an election followed almost immediately after that decision; do you know that?—Yes, a general election in January 1833.

1495. Then you know when this decision took place; you know the period?—I am not sure as to the period, but my understanding of it is, that it was after the general registry in October 1832.

1496. Shortly previous to the general election?—I do not know from my own knowledge, when the case came before Baron Pennefather. I have supposed, in the answers I have given already, that these non-resident freemen were rejected at the first registry in October 1832, and that they came under Baron Pennefather's consideration previous to the general election in 1833; but whether that was the case or not I do not know.

1497. Did you not state just now your conjecture as to the motive of Baron Pennefather for not reserving the case for the twelve judges was, that those persons would be called upon to vote at the general election shortly after his decision?—That I stated as my conjecture for his coming to that decision.

1498. Then, if so, you must have known the fact that Baron Pennefather's decision took place shortly previous to the general election?—I have already stated that I know no fact in reference to the Cork election at all, and that I am merely speaking from what has been stated in reference to it in the Committee here, and from what I heard at that very remote period. I know nothing about it.

1499. You do not know anything more about it than what is enough to enable you to conjecture as to the judge's intention?—I give that as a guess why he came to that conclusion without consulting the judges; but I do not know whether that guess is well or ill founded; it may not be worth a straw, for anything I know to the contrary.

1500. But you know enough about it to enable you to conjecture as to the judge's intention?—No; I stated I knew nothing about it.

1501. Mr. *Attorney-General* for Ireland.] You made a conjecture favourable to the judge without knowing any of the facts; is not that so?—I have stated that conjecture; I would be anxious to draw a favourable conclusion as to the conduct of all judges.

1502. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Excepting the assistant barristers?—Including them; I respect them as judges in a degree in proportion to their rank, as much as I do other judges.

1503. Are you aware that the registry took place in October?—The general registry did.

1504. Are you aware Baron Pennefather arrived in Cork from the summer assizes about the close of that registry, in the month of October, the circuit having been put off in consequence of the cholera?—I am not aware of that circumstance; I have never attended that circuit, and I am not aware of the dates connected with the transaction.

1505. You are now aware of this, that if he was in Cork in October, there was a term intervened between that October and the election?—I know, in Belfast, the registry terminated about the 10th of November 1832, as I recollect, and if the question did not come before Baron Pennefather until after that, a term would not intervene; but I do not know at what period the Cork sessions ended, nor do I know at what period the subject came before Baron Pennefather's observation.

1506. But in the case you supposed they could not come before Baron Pennefather until the ensuing March or April, for he would not be in Cork on circuit until then?—Certainly not; he would not be in Cork until March or April; but at what period the question came under his observation I do not know. It appears from the question previously put to me, that there was an adjournment of the assizes.

1507. A postponement, in consequence of the cholera. Well, but in case the assizes did not intervene between the registry and the term, it could not occur until after the election?—I do not know; the assizes may have been adjourned in the year you refer to, under the circumstances mentioned, to some period after the month of November, but before the January election in 1833. I know nothing of that circumstance from my own knowledge.

1508. *Chairman*.] In point of fact, all you have been stating about this Cork registration is simply from general hearsay and general rumour?—Simply.

1509. You do not pretend to know anything about it?—Nothing whatever.

1510. Neither

1510. Neither the motives of the judge, whether good or bad, or even the facts of the case?—No.

1511. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] You have formed an opinion as to Baron Pennefather's conduct in a particular matter; are you aware of the degree of estimation in which Baron Pennefather is held, not only by professional persons in Ireland, but likewise by the public generally?—No judge can be held in higher estimation than Baron Pennefather is.

1512. Does that circumstance afford to your mind any legal ground of inference as to the propriety of his conduct in any particular matter that came judicially before him?—I am quite satisfied that Baron Pennefather would decide any judicial question, and every judicial question that came before him, upon his best consideration of the law.

1513. And with the utmost purity of intention?—Certainly. I believe Baron Pennefather's purity of intention has not been ventured to be impeached, at least not from any quarter that I am aware of.

1514. Is not Baron Pennefather a gentleman whose character as a private member of society likewise ranks as high as the character of any individual in Ireland?—I have heard his private character spoken of in very high terms indeed. I, of course, speak merely from hearsay on that subject, but he is very highly esteemed personally.

1515. So therefore, as a judge and as a private individual, it is difficult to mention the name of any person held in more general or just estimation than he is in Ireland?—He is very highly esteemed indeed.

1516. Mr. O'Connell.] But with all these good qualities, he yet may be very mistaken upon a registry question, may he not?—Baron Pennefather may err upon a registry question, no doubt.

1517. Now, from everything you have heard, have you any suspicion in your mind that he did err very much on the construction of the registry, with perfect purity?—In reference to the question before alluded to?

1518. Yes.—If the question has since been decided by the twelve judges, I have no legal doubt about it now; but, as I stated before, we have no freemen, or but five or six, connected with Belfast, and the question of resident or non-resident has not been raised with us. Mr. O'Dwyer disposed of all the non-residents by rejecting them.

1519. Well, you yourself can form no opinion on the question of residence?—My opinion would be that it excludes freemen who are resident seven Irish miles from the borough town; but I certainly would not have ventured to express that opinion while the question was before Baron Pennefather, and possibly I would not be enabled to express an opinion on the subject had it not been for the decision of it.

1520. Now let me help you. Have you ever seen the oath that freemen have to take on being registered?—I have seen it; but I have no recollection that ever I have read that oath.

1521. It is in Schedule C., No. 9, and this is the oath: "and that I am, and for the last six months have been, a resident within the said city (whatever it be) or borough, or within seven statute miles of the usual place of election in the said borough." Now, if you read that oath, would you have any hesitation in giving an opinion that no man who could not swear that oath ought to be registered?—As far as that oath goes, it certainly would appear to me that the party must be resident within seven statute miles; and, as far as I had any information at all about the question (the question arises upon the statutes generally, and the oath taken in connexion with them), that oath certainly appears to me as embodying the fact that they must be resident within seven miles.

1522. It helps you then quite as much on the question of residence as the oath on the question of occupation?—Yes.

1523. At least?—It helps me as much.

1524. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Are you aware that in that affidavit, found in the Schedule to this Act of Parliament, letter C., No. 9, there are in various parts of it "as the case may be"—"as the case may be" in parentheses?—I have already stated that I do not recollect reading that Schedule, it not having been necessary for me to act upon it.

1525. Do you see between various brackets there, "as the case may be"?—I do. I do, certainly; in four instances I observe it.

Mr. John Bates.
9 March 1837.

1526. Mr. O'Connell.] It is, "I, A. B., in the city or town or borough of _____, merchant, or, as the case may be;" that is, whatever description he belongs to, merchant or trader or attorney?—Shall I read the oath?

1527. Yes.—"I, A. B., of _____, in the city or town or borough of _____, merchant, or, &c., as the case may be, do swear."

1528. What meaning do you put to the "&c." there, "or, &c., as the case may be?"—His description or his business is to be stated there; that I am a freeman, or other corporate officer, as the case may be.

1529. Now the meaning of "as the case may be" there, is, that he should describe himself as a freeman or a burgess, or other corporate officer, as the case may be, is it not?—Yes, I believe that to be the meaning there "of the said city, town or borough, having a right to vote at elections for the said city, &c."

1530. The "&c." there means town or borough?—Yes.

1531. Now leave out the brackets, and go on?—"And that I am, and for the last six months, have been a resident within the said city, &c."

1532. That means town or borough?—Yes; "of _____, or within seven statute miles of the usual place of election within the said city, town or borough, as the case may be."

1533. And the latter, "as the case may be," means either city, town or borough, as the case may be?—Yes, in my opinion, that would be the meaning of it.

1534. Mr. Hamilton.] The constituency of Belfast is a very large one, I believe?—It is very numerous.

1535. You have had a good deal of experience in the registration of that constituency?—Yes.

1536. Is it your opinion, without reference to conservative or radical, is it your opinion, that from those nice distinctions and legal questions that have been talked of so much to-day, inconvenience and evils have arisen to the franchise?—I certainly know that a considerable degree of uncertainty has latterly been introduced as to the question of the franchise. The questions involving the registry appeared to me to be understood pretty well during the period of the registry of Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry and Mr. Mayne.

1537. Generally, is it your opinion that inconvenience and evils to the franchise have arisen from that uncertainty?—Yes.

1538. Has that uncertainty had a tendency to create a habit of swearing upon a matter of opinion rather than a matter of fact?—I cannot state any instance in which that has occurred; but my belief is, that it is calculated to lead to that.

1539. And that, I presume, in your opinion, leads to a loose habit of swearing?—Yes.

1540. Then you think, if a fixed standard with regard to the franchise could be devised, it would be exceedingly desirable?—Certainly, very desirable on every question connected with the franchise.

1541. And that questions of the precise legal meaning of the profession of value, or anything of that kind, would not then arise?—No.

1542. Mr. O'Connell.] Will you raise the standard or lower it?—What standard?

1543. Of value?—I would keep the standard of value as it is; we are very well satisfied with it in Belfast, when administered under what we had been led to believe were the provisions of the Reform Act.

1544. You would not wish to lower it?—No, I am quite satisfied it would be attended with great mischief.

1545. Do you think it would be attended with any mischief to raise it?—In reference to Belfast, I do not see any advantage to be gained by raising the franchise.

1546. If it were lower it would increase the number of electors, of course?—Of course it would.

1547. It would diminish the conservatives in a relative proportion?—No.

1548. Would it not at Belfast?—No.

1549. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] The nice distinctions that you have been asked concerning, by the honourable Member for the city of Dublin, were principally introduced, I believe, by the conservative party; the objections grounded on those nice distinctions?—At what period?

1550. From time to time; did they not originate with the conservative party?—The questions of law upon which we had understood the provisions of the Reform Act

to be settled were questions raised by both parties at the general registry in October 1832. It was at that period that these questions were raised; raised by each party in common, as suited their interests generally.

1551. You do not think that the conservative party originated more of these questions than the liberal party?—No; some of those questions that were decided then were supported by both parties.

1552. Then both parties joined in introducing those questions?—Yes.

1553. And are equally responsible for them?—And are equally responsible for them; but the introduction at that period of those questions led to what was then considered the settlement of them.

1554. Then, if those questions are doubtful questions, they arose from the fault of the law, the uncertainty of the law?—If there is reasonable ground to entertain legal doubts, they are certainly the faults of the law.

1555. Mr. *Lefroy*.] But did not the uncertainty which now exists originate in a departure from what had been, under several barristers, taken as the acknowledged construction of the Reform Act?—Yes, taken as the acknowledged construction of the Act by both parties.

1556. By which party was the first experiment made to infringe on the settled construction of the Reform Act?—The first departure from the principles that had been acted upon at the registry in Belfast was by Mr. *Fogarty*. But those questions were questions that occurred generally to his own mind; I cannot recollect whether they were raised. Some of them certainly did occur to his own mind, and were not raised by either party.

Luna, 13^o die Martii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.
Mr. Serjeant Ball.
Mr. Milnes Gaskell.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. O'Connell.

Mr. M. J. O'Connell.
Mr. Moore O'Ferrall.
Lord Granville Somerset.
Mr. Emerson Tenment.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *John Bates*, called in; and further Examined.

1557. Mr. *Emerson Tenment*.] DO you remember what the general course of proceeding was, of the registering barristers of Belfast, with regard to the admission of persons who let off portions of their houses to lodgers; were they admitted by Mr. O'Dwyer?—The question did not arise before Mr. O'Dwyer; it was first brought under the consideration of Mr. *Mayne*, and upon argument he rejected them for the purpose of trying the question.

1558. Do you remember who the party was who appealed from his rejection?—*William Phillips* and several others.

1559. Do you recollect the particular circumstances of that appeal with reference to the portion of the house he let off, and the value of the portion he retained in his own possession?—When the question was originally raised before Mr. *Mayne*, the question as to the value of what the applicant retained in his exclusive occupation was not taken into consideration: the objection to the claimant was on the ground of having set off any portion of his house; but when the appeal from the assistant barrister's decision on that question came before Mr. Justice *Johnson*, the counsel for the appellant, Mr. *Phillips*, proposed to prove that the portion that Mr. *Phillips* retained in his own occupation was worth 10 L. a-year; that was admitted on the other side, and upon that state of facts the question was argued. I have here a report of the argument on the decision of the case; it is reported in the *Law Recorder*, a legal periodical publication, in Dublin, of high character, I believe; I believe the *Law Recorder* is the highest legal periodical of that character; it is edited by Mr. *Echlin Molyneux*, barrister-at-law; the case is reported in the 4th volume of that periodical, at page 36. It is unnecessary to occupy the time of the Committee by reading the arguments of counsel upon the occasion, but I will read the statement in reference to the judgment given upon it: "*Baron Pennefather*, on the 8th of November, while presiding for the purpose of hearing motions at the equity side, took occasion to address Mr. *Deering* upon the subject in the following terms:—Mr. *Deering*, although it does not properly belong to

Mr. *John Bates*.

13 March 1837.

Mr. John Bates.

13 March 1837.

the business of the day, I take the opportunity of advertg to a case in which you were concerned at the last assizes for Fermanagh, and in which I suspended my decision until I should take the opinion of the judges upon the point then reserved; I mean the claim of a householder to register as an elector in a borough, where part of the house has been let to lodgers. The opinion of all the judges present, when the point was argued, with the exception of Mr. Justice Johnson, who differs with the rest, is, that the letting a portion of the house to lodgers where the part retained in the actual occupation of the proprietor is of the annual value of 10 l., does not deprive the householder of his right to vote; we think that a person who is owner of an entire house, part of which is let to lodgers, but who is himself in exclusive occupation of a portion of it to the extent of 10 l. in value, is entitled to register as a voter, notwithstanding the remainder may be let to lodgers." I find in the 64th page of the 4th volume of the Law Recorder the following observations by the editor in explanation of his report: "Registry—Householder. It would appear that some misapprehension has arisen with respect to the decision of the judges upon the household franchise under the Reform Act, as reported in page 43 of the present volume; the editor would, therefore, direct the attention of the readers of this publication to the facts, arguments, and judgment as already given, from which it is manifest that no adjudication has been made affecting the claim of a householder to register, who having let a portion of his house to lodgers, retains the exclusive possession of a part of less annual value than 10 l., the entire house being of 10 l. annual value. The cases which gave rise to the argument were those of persons who respectively retained the exclusive possession of portions of their houses necessarily assumed to be of the requisite value, as no objection on the ground of insufficiency of value appeared upon the record from the Assistant Barrister's Court; for, according to the provisions of the Reform Act, the court of appeal has no authority to put the claimant on proof of value, unless such an objection be stated as the ground of the assistant barrister's rejection. Accordingly Mr. Holmes, having first tendered evidence of the fact, afterwards assumed that there was no objection on the ground of value; and, as applicable to such a case, very forcibly contended that the same construction should be put upon the householder's affidavit, which for a series of years had been acquiesced in with respect to that of freeholders under 20 l. annual value, and according to which the words 'actual occupation' were considered to be perfectly compatible with an assignment or subdemise of part of the claimant's own holding where the part retained in his exclusive occupation was of the requisite value.

Note.—"The editor omitted to state the name of Mr. Justice Torrens, in addition to those of Mr. Justice Burton and Baron Smith, as having been absent from the conference of the judges."

1560. Do you recollect what Mr. Fogarty's practice was subsequent to that decision?—At the registry, in January 1836, when Mr. Fogarty first presided, that question was brought under his consideration. I have here the Belfast Guardian of January 12th, 1836, which contains the report of Mr. Fogarty's decisions at that session, as reported by myself. I will read the case in which the question was brought under Mr. Fogarty's consideration: "John Bodkin, claimant, stated he held a house in Joy-street, worth more than 10 l. a-year, for six months past, and had paid all taxes due.—Cross-examined by Mr. Whiteside: Do you occupy the entire house yourself? Answer: I do, except part let to lodgers.—As you state you have let part of your house in lodgings, is the part which you have retained in your actual occupation worth ten pounds a-year? Will not swear that it is worth 10 l. a-year.—Mr. Whiteside then submitted to the barrister that this was a case concluded by the decision of the judges. The general question, that where a party lets a portion of his house to lodgers he is not, therefore, disqualified to register, he would not presume to argue, the twelve judges having decided that such a fact did not disqualify him, and therefore admitted most fully that a party who let a portion of his house to lodgers would be entitled to register, provided he retained premises in his actual occupation to the value of 10 l. a-year. When Mr. Holmes argued the general question at the Carrickfergus assizes, on behalf of an appellant from the decision of Mr. Mayne, who had rejected him on the ground of his having let lodgings, he commenced his argument by insisting that the remainder of the house in the claimant's own occupation was of the value required by the Act, which he offered to prove, if controverted on the other side. That fact was fully admitted by Mr. Gilmer and himself (Mr. Whiteside), and upon that admitted fact the question was argued before Judge Johnson, and afterwards

wards before the twelve judges, and by them decided in favour of the claimant; but the qualified proposition, that the claimant should retain premises in his possession to the value of 10 *l.* a-year, was in equally express terms decided by the twelve judges. Fortunately he was able to supply the court with a report on this very point from an authentic source; Mr. Molyneux, whose accuracy would not be questioned, had reported the decision of the judges in the following terms." The report of the decision, as I have read it, is then inserted.

1561. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] What you call the decision of the judges is what Baron Pennefather stated?—Yes; Baron Pennefather's report of that decision. "Mr. Whiteside then submitted, that upon the authority of this case all argument was precluded, the voter having stated that he did not occupy premises to the extent of 10 *l.* in value, and that the applicant should be rejected. The barrister stated that he admitted the perfect accuracy of Mr. Molyneux's report, having been present when the judgment was delivered; but he did not think the decision went to the extent for which Mr. Whiteside contended; for he had reason to know that that was not the view entertained by some of the judges, and that it would have been more satisfactory if the judgment of Baron Pennefather had been delivered in presence of the other judges. Mr. Whiteside said he conceived the barrister was bound to conclude that the decision of an eminent judge, admitted to have been faithfully reported and delivered in the presence of the bar, correctly stated the opinion of his brother judges, whose sentiments he professed to speak. The barrister said he only meant to convey that he did not think the judges were unanimous in opinion to the extent contended for; but admitted, to the fullest extent, if the twelve judges had decided this precise question, he would be bound by that decision and would act upon it, no matter what his individual opinion might be. However, as he conceived that the judgment cited, as reported by Mr. Molyneux, did not go this length, inasmuch as it only decides affirmatively that a person who is owner of an entire house, part of which is let to lodgers, who is himself in exclusive occupation of a portion of it to the extent of 10 *l.* in value, is entitled to register, notwithstanding the remaining portion of the house may be let to lodgers; but the judgment does not, by any negative words, exclude a householder who does not retain in his exclusive occupation a portion of the premises to the extent of 10 *l.* a-year in value. Mr. Whiteside said it would appear to him most difficult to give that construction to the judgment, for in logic, and in sound reason as well as in law, an affirmative proposition constantly implied a negative. Were the principle laid down by the barrister well founded, it might as well be contended that where the reform statute enacts that every person holding a house worth 10 *l.* a-year shall be entitled to register, and does not proceed to negative the right of a person holding a house worth but 2 *l.* a-year to register, therefore that every person holding a house worth but 2 *l.* a-year shall be entitled to register. The barrister then said, that having stated his impression he would be most happy to hear Mr. Whiteside argue the general question. Mr. Whiteside said, as at present advised he must respectfully decline to do so; for as to the general question that a party was not disentitled to register by letting lodgings, that question had been expressly decided by the twelve judges, and he therefore would not presume to raise an argument upon it; and as to the qualified proposition, for which alone he contended, it appeared to him the English language could not in more express terms than were contained in Baron Pennefather's judgment, have decided that a person who had let part of his house to lodgers should retain in his exclusive occupation a portion to the value of 10 *l.* a-year. The barrister expressed his desire to hear Mr. Nelson argue the question. Mr. Nelson then addressed the bench, and read and commented on the seventh section of the Reform Bill, and referred to the able judgment of Lord Hardwicke in the case of *Frinder v. Lome* as detailed in Mr. Hudson's book, and commented thereon. He insisted that lodgers were but inmates, and that when the judges had decided that the person who took lodgers was, nevertheless, in actual occupation of the house, they had, in fact, decided this present question; and if by that judgment the person who took lodgers was in possession and actual occupation of the whole, it was impossible to make the fact of his having let a part of the house to lodgers a ground for his exclusion from registering. He then remarked on the judgment of Baron Pennefather, and said, that what was there reported being merely in the affirmative, it did not negatively exclude an applicant, situated as the present, from registering. Mr. Whiteside, without waiving the benefit of the decision of the judges, as first insisted on by him, in deference to the wish of the

Mr. John Botes.

13 March 1837.

Mr. John Bates.

13 March 1837.

barrister, argued the question in reply, and read Mr. Gilmer's argument, as reported by Mr. Molyneux. He stated he could perfectly well understand how the judges should wish to give the franchise to every person substantially entitled thereto; and whilst they admitted the right of claimants, who had let portions of their houses to lodgers, to register, at the same time should decide that they should retain in their actual occupation a portion of the premises to the value of 10*l.* a-year. He also adverted to and commented in reply to the arguments of Mr. Nelson. The barrister, in giving judgment, then reviewed at length the objects of the statute, and the intentions of the legislature to extend the franchise, and observed upon the oath as contained in the schedule. He said the word 'possession' was important, and would be deprived of its legal meaning, unless interpreted as by him, viz. that the meaning of the legislature, by the words 'possession and actual occupation,' was satisfied by the claimant being in the legal possession of the whole house, and in the actual occupation of a part. He also referred to the section relating to 5*l.* householders, in support of his view; and again repeated, that if he believed the twelve judges had decided this question, he would act upon that decision; but as he did not think that it was so decided by them, and as he did not see how a house could be divisible for the purpose of the franchise, on the best consideration he could give the matter he would admit the claimant, and ruled accordingly. Mr. Whiteside then applied to the barrister to have this one case so disposed of as would enable an appeal to be lodged to have the opinion of the judges on this point; that if the claimant were admitted, no appeal could be lodged; but by rejecting him at present, an appeal could be lodged, and the matter decided by the next going judge of assize without the claimant being in the slightest degree prejudiced; because, if the judges confirmed the decision of the barrister, the registration of the claimant would take effect from the date of his application to the barrister at sessions. Mr. Whiteside pressed this the more strongly, as there would be a number of cases involving the same point in the course of the sessions, and it would be satisfactory to have one case brought under the decision of the judges, to have their opinion thereon. The barrister said, as he had formed his opinion upon the best consideration he could give the matter, he did not see why he should delay acting thereon; and that if his decision were wrong, Mr. Whiteside's clients could have that decision rectified by a Committee of the House of Commons. Mr. Whiteside begged to remind the barrister, that the preamble of the statute to which the barrister had already referred, recited the object of the statute to be, not only to extend the elective franchise, but also to diminish the expenses of elections; which latter object would be frustrated if the party were deprived of an appeal to the judges, and driven to the enormous expense of one to the Committee of the House of Commons. The barrister declared he could not, according to the dictates of his judgment, act otherwise, and therefore refused the appeal."

1562. Mr. E. Tenant.] It would appear from that report, that the impression of the barrister was, that one half only of this question had been decided by the judges; namely, the case in which the owner of the house retained in his own possession a portion worth 10*l.* Are you aware whether any decision has yet been had from the judges, of a case in which the person retained less in his own hand than of the value of 10*l.*?—Yes, but in reference to the previous part of the question, I am not prepared to state what Mr. Fogarty's impression was. He considered that he was bound by the judgment of the twelve judges to reject the applicant, because he did not retain 10*l.* worth in his own occupation. But at the same sessions there were two or three other cases occurred, which I will mention to the Committee.

1563. Mr. O'Connell.] Have you been informed that the judges met immediately after the decision you speak of, and during the very sessions that Mr. Fogarty was registering, in order to discuss among themselves the grounds of the decision in the case in which Baron Pennefather stated an opinion in the manner you have mentioned?—I read an article in the Belfast Northern Whig in which that circumstance was stated, but I have not heard it from any other authority, and upon a law question I consider that no authority; I mean that upon a report of a decision of a law case by the judges I consider that no authority.

1564. There was a statement that the judges agreed that their determination was upon the abstract question of lodger or no lodger, and not upon the relative value of the part used by the elector himself?—There was a statement put forward in an article inserted in that paper in defence of Mr. Fogarty.

1565. Was it to the effect just described?—There was an article in the North-

ern

ern Whig, published in Belfast on the 28th of January, put forward in justification of Mr. Fogarty's view of the question, in which it is stated, (I now read from the paper itself,) "On the first day of the present term the twelve judges met, and after a consultation on the point which was brought before them by Judge Johnson, they agreed unanimously that if a man taking lodgers have a house worth 10*l.* a-year, it matters not whether the part retained in his own possession be or be not worth 10*l.* a-year, and that in either case he is entitled to register, and that this was the necessary result of their own former decision. We are happy to be the first to announce this important determination, and we do it upon authority which cannot be mistaken." While I read that to the Committee, I feel it right to add that the statement has never been supported by any legal authority that I have ever seen. I am told that inquiries were made after any such decision, and it has not been ascertained that any such was made; and in this view of it I am supported by a report that I have read in the Dublin Weekly Register, of a case argued before Mr. Justice Crampton. It appears from what fell from the learned judge upon that occasion, that he is quite ignorant of any such question having been decided. The date of the Dublin Morning Register, from which I quote this, is Saturday, February 11th 1837: "Court of King's Bench, Monday.—City of Dublin Appeals.—Important case. The case of Bernard Dignan, of No. 9, Molesworth-place, who claimed to register from a house for which he paid a rent of 26*l.*, but who had been rejected by Mr. Dobbs, in consequence of his having let to lodgers the greater portion of his house, having in his own distinct occupation but a room and kitchen of the yearly value of 8*l.*, was called on. Mr. Curran said that Mr. Dixon and Mr. Seton were with him, and that as they were not in attendance he would beg of the court to postpone the argument until the next day. Judge Crampton: Go on, Mr. Curran, you will have the more honour by yourself. Mr. Curran then argued that the claimant was entitled to register on the decision of the twelve judges in the Carrickfergus case, where the letting a portion of the house to lodgers was decided as not invalidating the qualification; it had been however reported that that decision had been come to on the understanding that the applicant held in his own exclusive occupation a portion of the house of the value of 10*l.*, and on that had Mr. Dobbs rejected this claim. Mr. Curran then read the report of the arguments in that case from the Law Recorder, page 36, and the connexion as to the particular point relied on in page 64. He contended that the question as to the value of the portion in the applicant's distinct occupation had not been raised, and therefore was not material to that issue; that the question of actual occupation was entirely out of the present argument, as all the cases relied upon by the other side, viz., *Rex v. Inhabitants of Rochester*, in 5 Barnewell and Adolphus, or *Rex v. St. Nicholas of Colchester*, 4 Neville and Manning, &c., had been urged by the counsel who argued the Carrickfergus case, and therefore the only question was as to whether the claimant in taking the affidavit swore to the occupation of the whole house, or the part only in which he himself dwelt. Mr. Curran cited several cases to show that occupation meant the occupation of the entire house, and quoted Lord Hardwicke's judgment in the case of *Frinder v. Lome*, and Lord Denman's in a similar one. Messrs. Litton and Brewster on the other side argued that the claimant should be in the exclusive occupation of so much as would be of the value required by the Act, inasmuch as that should be considered as his house, and that from so much was he entitled to make his affidavit, and cited several cases in support of their view of the question. Mr. Seton replied, and read a number of authorities as to the constructive meaning of the word occupation. Judge Crampton stated that as the matter had been argued at full length before, and considered by his brethren, he should wish to have their opinion on this question; however, he wished to state that the reported judgment of the case was incorrect, inasmuch as no decision had been come to on this particular point, and that what had been given as such was merely the private opinions of some of the judges; that the judgment of Lord Hardwicke was what they mostly relied on, and which he was inclined still to be guided by; however, as in what way soever he should decide, some of his brethren would certainly differ with him, he thought it advisable to consult with them before giving judgment."

1566. You perceive in that, that Judge Crampton stated distinctly that some of his brethren were of the same opinion with Mr. Fogarty?—I perceive that; he states that some of his brethren would differ from him whichever way it was decided.

1567. Did you ever hear that the authority alluded to in the Northern Whig, upon which they make their statement, was that of Mr. Justice Perrin?—No, I did

Mr. John Bates.

23 March 1837.

not hear that that authority was Mr. Justice Perrin; I might suspect, but it was only suspicion that it was Mr. Justice Perrin.

1568. Have you any doubt that it is the opinion of Mr. Justice Perrin himself?—I do not know, nor can I form any opinion as to his judgment. I believe the public know nothing further of the decision referred to in the Northern Whig than that which is contained in the Northern Whig itself. It has never been supported further than a mere newspaper assertion.

1569. Will you read the first part of the heading of the article from which you have read the passage out of the Northern Whig?—"Mr. Davison's Attack on Mr. Fogarty."

1570. Who is Mr. Davison?—A solicitor, resident in Belfast.

1571. Has he anything to do with any of the parties in Belfast?—He has; I stated before that Mr. Davison was general conducting agent at the elections.

1572. He is the same Mr. Davison?—He is.

1573. You yourself joined in that attack on Mr. Fogarty in a speech?—I made no attack on Mr. Fogarty: those who assert I made any attack, I call upon them to produce any paper showing that I attacked him. I certainly observed that he entertained and acted upon opinions under the Reform Act which no other lawyer that I was aware of acted upon; I still think so, but I have stated that I do not impute any corrupt motive to Mr. Fogarty in acting upon those principles.

1574. Did you impute to him partiality?—I did not impute to him partiality in the application of those principles.

1575. You do not consider this an attack upon Mr. Fogarty: "I do charge those by whom he has been appointed with the intentional selection of a gentleman who entertains and puts into practice views of the Reform Act which have never been held by any lawyer; and I charge them with making this selection at the request, or to forward the interests of a political party in this town." Is that an accurate report of your speech?—It is not. The writer of that article, I cannot doubt it, intentionally left out the previous part of my observations in reference to Mr. Fogarty, in which I disclaimed any intention to make a charge against him of either corruption or partiality, and I would be exceedingly glad, that as my observations on that occasion have been referred to, and I think it would be but justice, if those who have referred to them would produce a full report of what I did say.

1576. Did the previous part of your speech, a part not reported here, disclaim upon your part any intention of imputing partiality or corruption to Mr. Fogarty?—It did.

1577. Unequivocally?—According to the best of my recollection in distinct terms.

1578. That which has just been read is in a note to the article in the Northern Whig, to which you referred, headed as you have before described?—Yes.

1579. Mr. Hamilton.] Was there a full and correct report of your speech in regard to that part of it in any other paper?—In every one of the Belfast papers, with the exception of the Northern Whig, which paper attacked my observations, without giving them all.

1580. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] In that which you have read as Judge Crampton's observations upon the appeal to him on the lodger point, he states that a certain reported judgment which had been cited to him was not correct. Now what reported judgment does that refer to? Is that Mr. Molyneux's report?—I do not know whether it is Mr. Molyneux's report, or the report referred to in the question just put to me.

1581. Will you look at the preceding part of the argument before Judge Crampton, and state whether the decision in the Northern Whig was at all adverted to?—It does not appear to have been adverted to.

1582. The decision as reported by Baron Pennefather was recited and read?—Yes.

1583. Does not it follow that Judge Crampton could not have adverted to any other report than that report, by Mr. Molyneux, of the decision as purporting to be delivered by Baron Pennefather?—As far as this report goes, certainly the fair conclusion is, that it was a decision as reported in the Law Recorder; but my doubt arose from Judge Crampton stating that there was no decision upon this particular point; that is, on the question of whether this claimant who occupied a house worth 26*l.*, but only held in his exclusive occupation 8*l.* of it, whether he was entitled to register or not. Judge Crampton's observation was, that there had

been

been no decision upon that particular point, the question involved in that particular case.

1584. But as it stands there, the only report to which he could have referred is that of Mr. Molyneux?—That is the natural conclusion.

1585. Mr. *Lefroy*.] If there had been a report of a decision subsequent to the reported decision by Baron Pennefather, and over-ruling it, do not you think that Judge Crampton would have adverted to it?—I think that he undoubtedly would, because if there was any such decision it would have rendered it unnecessary for Judge Crampton to have reserved this question for the opinion of the judges. The question would have been decided by the judgment reported in the *Northern Whig*, if that report had been true.

1586. Mr. *Emerson Tennent*.] It would appear from the documents which you have read to the Committee, that there has been no decision of the judges upon the point, with regard to the retention in the claimant's hands of 10*l.*?—No.

1587. It would appear that that is a point upon which there is still a division of opinion among the judges?—Yes.

1588. What was the date of the last paper which you read from the *Morning Register*?—The 11th of February 1837.

1589. So that up to this period that point does not appear to have been decided?—Yes.

1590. Under those circumstances of doubt it appears that Mr. Fogarty refused to allow a claim to be rejected, so that an appeal might be had to the judges upon it?—Yes.

1591. Did the applicant himself offer to consent to the rejection, in order that it might be tried?—There was one case at the sessions of January 1835, at which that offer was made. It is the case of John Craig—"John Craig, Torrrens Market, claimed to register out of a house. Answered the usual questions to the barrister, and stated his house to be worth 10*l.* a-year. Cross-examined by Mr. Nelson: Admitted a portion of his house was let to lodgers; he would not swear that the remaining portion in his own occupation was worth 10*l.* a-year. Mr. Whiteside then offered to consent that this vote should be rejected, in order that the question before raised should be brought before the judges by appeal. The barrister, however, declined to accede to this proposal, and admitted the vote."

1592. Mr. *O'Connell*.] That was a conservative vote?—It was where a Conservative was willing to stand rejected for the purpose of trying the question, and Mr. Fogarty refused to permit the rejection.

1593. Mr. *E. Tennent*.] Are you aware whether many persons have been admitted upon the register in Belfast similarly situated, persons who did not hold in their actual occupation a house worth 10*l.*?—A great many must have been admitted since, and including the January register of 1836.

1594. Looking at the general provisions of the Reform Act, can you discover in that practice anything tending to an extensive evasion of fictitious voters?—Assuming it to be the intention of the legislature, that property is indicated by the party's ability to pay for a house worth 10*l.* a-year, was the criterion upon which they would confer the franchise, I do think that by a number of, say three, persons, neither of whom have sufficient means to pay for a house worth 10*l.*, clubbing together, and one of them taking the house, and the rest of them becoming lodgers, in that way a very large constituency would be created, to which the intentions of the legislature as to property would not apply.

1595. By the case you have put to the Committee, it would appear that one-third of the persons disqualified by law would by this practice be permitted to register?—One-third of those who would enter into such an arrangement as that I have contemplated, supposing my view of the intention of the legislature to be correct.

1596. Mr. *O'Connell*.] You have already read the opinion of Judge Crampton, that some of the judges are of opinion that those individuals would not be disqualified by law?—Yes, I have read his opinions stating that there is a difference of opinion among the judges, but what that difference is I cannot state. I suppose it refers to the question in the way in which it has just been put.

1597. Does not it follow that it must, because the question before him was in a case where the party had let his house to lodgers, and occupied for his own use only the kitchen and some other premises, valued at 8*l.* a-year?—Yes.

1598. Then you perceive that that person had in his own use only 8*l.* a-year worth of the house?—Yes.

Mr John Bates.

13 March 1837.

1599. Looking at Judge Crampton's judgment, do not you find words to this effect: "In whatsoever way I decide this point, some of the judges will differ"?—
"As in what way soever he should decide, some of his brethren would certainly differ with him, he thought it advisable to consult with them before giving judgment."

1600. So that if he decided against the vote, some of his brethren would differ with him?—Yes.

1601. And equally if he decided for it?—Yes.

1602. How many years' standing are you as an attorney?—Not long, only about two years.

1603. Do you conceive yourself qualified to settle the point of law, which of the number of judges are right?—Indeed I do not; I do not wish to prejudice the question in any way, that is evident from the paper that I quoted from the Morning Register, a radical paper.

1604. Now look at Campbell's case. Have not you represented in your report, that the entire of Campbell's house was set to lodgers?—I will read the report of the case, from which the Committee will see what I have represented. "John Campbell, Caddell's Entry, claimed to register out of a house. Claimant proved the value to be of 10*l.* a-year; that he had been in possession for six months, and had paid all taxes. On cross-examination it appeared no part of the house was held entirely by himself, but all set to nightly lodgers."

1605. Did you intend to convey by that report of the cross-examination, that he had parted with all the house in lodgings?—Occasionally.

1606. And used none of it for his own use?—Used none of it for his exclusive use.

1607. Do you mean to say that he used none of it to live in; that he quitted the house and left it all to lodgers?—No, the word "entirely," which I state here, would not have been introduced if that had been the meaning. I state here that it appeared no part of the house was held entirely by himself.

1608. Did not he hold that part entirely by himself upon which he slept?—It appeared, that when the house was crowded with nightly lodgers he and his family slept in a room with some of them.

1609. Then, in point of fact, he constantly resided with his family in that house?—He did.

1610. And you think that your report does not imply the contrary?—My report implies that he had not the exclusive occupation of any portion of the house, but that it was all set to nightly lodgers, who, from the circumstance of their being nightly lodgers, must have been but occasionally there.

1611. He slept in that house with his family?—Yes.

1612. He cooked his victuals in that house for himself and his family?—I cannot convey to the Committee, at least I will not take upon me from recollection to convey, the miserable accommodation that the party appeared to have, from his own statement.

1613. But he had it?—He and his family certainly lived in the house.

1614. It appears that the note which you have read out of the Law Recorder is not appended to the case which you read, but is introduced several pages after?—Yes.

1615. Mr. Molyneux, this reporter, is a respectable gentleman, nearly connected with your counsel, Mr. Whiteside?—A highly respectable gentleman; and, I believe, was connected by a former marriage with the family with which Mr. Whiteside is connected by marriage. He is a gentleman of high character for integrity at the bar.

1616. William Phillips was the person upon whose right to register the question arose. It was a case arising in Belfast, and he was bound to make this oath:—"I, William Phillips, of such a street in the borough of Belfast, merchant, (or whatever he was,) do swear, that I am and have been for six calendar months last past in possession and actual occupation of the house situated at, (naming the street,) and that the said premises are *bond fide* of the clear yearly value of not less than 10*l.*"?—Yes; I believe that is the form of the oath.

1617. Is not it the house that he swears is of the clear yearly value of 10*l.*, and not a part of the house?—It is the premises, which, of course, must mean the house, that he swears are *bond fide* worth 10*l.*

1618. He does not swear that any part of the house is of the value of 10*l.*, but that the house itself is of the value of 10*l.*?—Yes.

1619. His

1619. Has not he also sworn, "That I am and have been for six calendar months last past in possession and actual occupation of the house situated at" such a place?—Yes.

1620. Then he has sworn positively, that he has occupied the house, and not a part of the house?—Yes.

1621. Is not there an essential difference between swearing to the actual occupation of a house, and swearing to the actual occupation of a part?—A legal difference.

1622. Would you swear that you were in the actual occupation of a house of which you occupied only a part?—I would not swear that I was in the actual occupation of a house of which I was only in the occupation of a part.

1623. But Phillips has sworn it, has not he?—No; I take it that Phillips has sworn that he occupies the house; and I would swear that I occupied the house, if I had a portion of it set to lodgers; I would take the oath that Mr. Phillips has taken.

1624. You know that Phillips was not required to swear that part of the house was of the value of 10*l.*?—That question was not entered upon on the occasion of his rejection.

1625. Do not you know that in the oath no man is required to swear that part of the house is of the value of 10*l.*?—In the oath he is not required, but at the assizes he offered by his counsel to prove that the part of the house was worth 10*l.*

1626. With reference to his swearing that he was in the actual occupation of the house, you yourself would swear that, though you had lodgers in the house, provided you occupied part yourself?—Yes.

1627. You perceive that in the oath there is no distinction made between the part you occupy yourself and the part occupied by lodgers, otherwise you would not take the oath?—In the oath there is no distinction.

1628. Then the occupation by lodgers is considered even by you as an occupation by yourself?—In a legal point of view I certainly would consider the portion which a lodger or inmate has of my house is in my own occupation; that the house is in my actual occupation notwithstanding a portion of it has been set to lodgers or inmates. I have not the legal control, certainly, over the part that my lodger has, till I get him out of it.

1629. But still you are in the actual occupation of that part held by your lodgers?—I am in the actual occupation notwithstanding a portion of it being occupied by lodgers or inmates.

1630. Does not the word, "the house," include that part which the lodgers occupy?—As to whether "the house" includes that, I think that is just the question that is now under the consideration of the judges, and with respect to which, in answer to a question I was asked some time since, I stated that I would not presume to give an opinion upon it. I certainly would not wish to give an opinion upon a question upon which the judges differ, till they have decided it.

1631. Did not you state distinctly, that although part of the house was occupied by lodgers, yet you would take the oath; that you understood it in that sense, that you would be able in point of conscience to take the oath, that you were in the actual occupation of that house?—Yes.

1632. Would not you therefore necessarily thereby swear that you were in the actual occupation in point of law of the part which your lodgers occupied?—As to whether that follows by the law of the Reform Act, I do conceive that that is one of the questions involved in the question before the judges.

1633. You have stated more than once that although a part of your house was occupied by lodgers, yet from your construction of it, you would take the oath that you were in the actual occupation of that house for six months, during which the lodgers were in it?—I did not say from my construction of the law, but I say on general principles I would take the oath that I was in the actual occupation of a dwelling-house, notwithstanding a portion of it was set to lodgers.

1634. And occupied by lodgers?—And occupied by lodgers.

1635. Then do not you perceive that by so swearing to your actual occupation of a dwelling-house, part of which was in the occupation of lodgers, you would swear to the actual occupation by yourself of the part which the lodgers were in?—I do not conceive that that follows. The ground upon which I would swear to the actual occupation of the house is from the circumstance of my residing in the house myself, and having the control of that house by the possession of the key of the

Mr. John Bates.
13 March 1837.

the door—by the control of the hall door. But it would not follow in my judgment that I was in the actual occupation of the portion which my lodgers occupied.

1636. Would not you take this oath?—Yes.

1637. If you had lodgers, would not they have a right to go in and out at all reasonable hours?—Certainly they would, but I would have the command of the hall door.

1638. Do you mean to say that any lodgers would pay you rent for lodgings without having the control of the hall door to go in and out at all reasonable hours?—Certainly; but then they would have that under my control, as landlord.

1639. Under your control, according to the contract. If they took the lodgings for six months, you would have no control to prevent their coming in and out at all reasonable hours?—No; I would have no control to prevent their coming in and out at all reasonable hours. If they attempted to come in at unreasonable hours, I then would have a control in my character of landlord.

1640. Can you make a distinction as to actual occupation by lodgers, being the actual occupation of the house by the owner of it, between the case where one room is occupied, and the case where two rooms are occupied?—I do not feel myself competent, in point of law, to make a distinction upon the subject.

1641. Nor where three out of four rooms are occupied?—I do not consider myself competent to enter upon these legal distinctions in reference to the Reform Act. I conceive they are all involved in the question now before the judges, and upon that question I do not consider myself competent to give an opinion to the Committee.

1642. But it certainly is the duty of every assistant barrister to give an opinion upon that subject?—Unquestionably upon every subject connected with the Reform Act that comes before him.

1643. Have you heard that there is unanimity among the assistant barristers, with the exception of Mr. Dobbs, the deputy for Dublin?—I do not know what the general opinion is, but I have heard of no other rejection upon that ground, since the reported decision of the judges, except by Mr. Dobbs. The reported decision I mean is that in the Law Recorder.

1644. Did you ever hear that Mr. Markley at first carried the lodger point to this extent, that in the city of Cork, where a room was occupied by its being let for storing apples, he considered that the owner was not in the actual occupation of the entire house, and rejected him upon that account?—No, I never heard that he carried it to that length.

1645. Have you ever inquired whether Mr. Markley himself does not now register all houses of the value of 10*l.* in which the owner resides, no matter how much of it may be let in lodgings?—No, I have not; I was aware that Mr. Markley was one of those barristers that held that persons who had lodgers could not register, but I am not aware of his subsequent practice.

1646. Mr. *Leffroy*.] When part of a house is let to lodgers, has the landlord, so residing in the house, any right of entry into the part let to lodgers?—If a tenant has taken the room from him, I should say he has not.

1647. Then, in point of fact, he cannot be the actual occupier of any part in the possession of lodgers?—No; he does not occupy that which his lodgers occupy.

1648. And has no right, in point of law, even to enter?—No, he has not.

1649. Then when you say you would take the oath that you actually occupied the house, though part was let to lodgers, would you intend by that oath to swear, in reference to the part in possession of lodgers, that you were in actual occupation of it?—I would intend to swear that I was the actual occupier as tenant of the house; but I would not intend to swear that I actually occupied that portion of the house which my lodger occupied.

1650. Then of course you would consider it an open question, whether taking the oath in that sense of it, was taking the oath in the sense in which the legislature meant to impose it?—Certainly that would be a question to be ascertained, in my opinion, from the law hearing upon the subject.

1651. In the case which has been referred to, Phillips's case, in which it appeared that the oath was taken, did not the circumstances appear there to show the actual state of the case, and that Phillips was not in the actual occupation of that part of it which was let to lodgers?—That appeared at the registry when he was rejected.

1652. And therefore all the circumstances calculated to raise the question were before

before the registering barrister?—Yes, all the circumstances calculated to raise the question as decided by the assistant barrister himself; he did not then go into the question as to the value of what Phillips retained in his exclusive possession.

1653. Did the doctrine, as held by Mr. Fogarty on this point, affect the interests of the two conflicting political parties at Belfast equally?—I think it affected the conservative interest prejudicially to a greater extent than the other. I am pretty well satisfied of that; but in what proportion, I am not prepared to say. I know that it was by the conservative party that the registry of those parties was opposed, conceiving that it was contrary to what the law was on the subject.

1654. Mr. O'Connell.] But whether a man was brought up by the conservative party or the liberal party, under similar circumstances, Mr. Fogarty registered both?—He did; we wanted him to reject one of them, for the purpose of trying the question.

1655. Then the question of actual occupation, according to the oath, is, you perceive, a question of law?—I think it is a question of fact, explained by the law.

1656. What meaning do you put upon swearing that you are in actual possession of a house; do not you mean that you are in possession of the entire house?—Yes, I do.

1657. When you swear that you are in actual occupation of a house, do not you mean that you are in the actual occupation of the entire house?—I mean in such a case as that put in reference to lodgers, that I occupy the house, having the control of the door; the other parties who are occupying it being merely my lodgers or inmates.

1658. Have not you already stated that you have no right to go into your lodger's room without his consent?—I have.

1659. That you have no more right to go there than a total stranger, without the lodger's consent?—Yes.

1660. And that you have no right to close the hall door against the lodger at reasonable hours?—That depends upon the terms of our contract.

1661. But in general the lodger must have that right?—He must have access at reasonable hours through the hall door.

1662. Then when you swear that you are in the actual occupation of a house, do not you mean that you are in the actual occupation of the entire house?—Yes, I do.

1663. And you take that oath, although there are lodgers in the house?—Although there are lodgers occupying a portion of the house.

1664. What portion they occupied would not be material in that view, unless they occupied the entire?—As to the materiality of that, upon legal principles, I have already stated that I consider that involved in the question that the judges have to decide upon this very subject.

1665. Supposing your house contained ten rooms, and there were lodgers in one room, you would take the oath that you were in the actual occupation of the house?—I would.

1666. If they occupied two rooms, would not you still take the oath?—I would.

1667. If they occupied three rooms, would not you take the oath?—I consider that there is nothing in the oath, as far as my humble judgment goes, which would preclude me from taking the oath, dependent upon the portion of the house that I had, provided I had a part of it; that is my view of it; what that view of it is worth, I do not know.

1668. Mr. Hamilton.] Then it follows from that, and it has followed in the case which has been alluded to, that a man occupying a part of a house only, and that part of very inconsiderable value, in point of fact being, in point of law, if that construction be right, in the legal occupation of the house, has been admitted to register?—Yes; in my reply to a former question put to me, I gave my answer without reference to the general hearing of the law, with which I am not conversant enough to presume to give an opinion upon it.

1669. The construction you put upon the oath is this, that you conceive that you, in point of law, occupying the whole house, although, in point of fact, your lodgers occupied portions of the house, you felt that you could take the oath?—Yes, that is my view of the oath in the schedule.

1670. Mr. O'Connell.] In the opinion which you have read from the Morning Register of Mr. Justice Crampton, there is a reference to an opinion of Lord Hardwicke's, in the case of *Fründer v. Lome*; that was a case supporting Mr. Fogarty's

Mr. John Bates.

13 March 1837.

view of the law?—Yes, that case appears to have been cited by Mr. Holmes on the argument of the lodger appeal.

1671. You perceive that, according to your own report of the proceedings at the registry sessions, Mr. Nelson cited the same case before Mr. Fogarty?—Yes.

1672. That case decided by Lord Hardwicke held, that householders who let lodgings were qualified to vote within the provisions of the English Act of the 11th of George the 1st, chapter 13; although it required, to entitle such to the franchise, that they should be the sole occupiers of the houses, and have actually been in possession of the same. Lord Hardwicke says in his judgment, "Why then does their having let lodgings make them cease to be the sole occupiers within the meaning of the statute? I must own, I have no notion that they do thereby cease to be so, for no man can be occupier of a house but either by living in one of his own, or in one that he hires, and a lodger was never considered by any one as an occupier of a house. It is not the common understanding of the word; neither the house, nor even any part of it can be properly said to be in tenure or occupation of the lodger; and this construction will answer the intention of the Act in preventing the multiplying votes, for, though a lodger should pay rates, yet will he not have power to vote, not being to be deemed a householder or occupier. Lodgers are inmates, and surely the taking inmates does not make a man cease to be in the occupation of his house." Now, does not Judge Crompton say that it was the judgment of Lord Hardwicke which was the most relied upon, and which he was inclined still to be guided by?—Yes.

1673. So that as far as he gave an opinion upon that point, he declared the inclination of his mind to go with that judgment of Lord Hardwicke's?—He declared that to be the judgment upon which he relied; what he relied upon it for I cannot take upon me to say.

1674. That case was also cited before Mr. Fogarty at Belfast?—Yes.

1675. And relied upon by him?—Relied upon by counsel before him, and I have no doubt by him in giving his judgment.

1676. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] Have you any doubt that a party cannot register out of a part of a dwelling-house as such?—I believe that a lodger cannot register out of part of a dwelling-house.

1677. Have you any doubt that a notice to register out of a part of a dwelling-house would be defective?—A notice to register out of part of a house would certainly be a bad notice.

1678. Then, where a party registers out of a dwelling-house, it must be out of the entire of the dwelling-house?—That I conceive is still connected with the subject of this judgment which is under the consideration of the judges, and upon which subject, while I am anxious to give every information that I can, I do consider myself incompetent to speak.

1679. Must not the occupation under the Act of Parliament be an occupation of the entire thing out of which the registry is to be effected?—It must be an occupation in the eye of the law of the entire thing.

1680. And not the occupation of part of the thing?—Yes.

1681. When a party is allowed to register out of a dwelling-house, part of which is occupied by a lodger, that party is nevertheless considered to be in the occupation of that part so held by the lodger?—He is considered to be in the occupation of the house, from his control and command over that house, but I do not conceive that he can be considered to be in the occupation of that portion of it which the lodger occupies.

1682. Is he not in the occupation of it in the sense in which the Act of Parliament uses the word?—That is just the question that I consider myself incompetent to form an opinion upon, because that depends upon the meaning of those terms in the Reform Act, which is the subject before the judges.

1683. The question is not in what meaning the Act of Parliament used the words "actual occupation," but whatever sense the Act of Parliament attached to those words, it requires the party registering to be in the occupation of the entire?—In the occupation of the house.

1684. In whatever sense the word occupation is there used?—Yes.

1685. The value of the house must be of 10 £ a-year?—Yes.

1686. The oath states that the house is in the occupation of the person taking the oath, and that it is of the value of 10 £ a-year?—It does.

1687. Have you any doubt that that which the oath states to be in the occupa-

tion of the party, and which it states to be of the value of 10 *l.* a-year, are one and the same thing?—From reading the affidavit by itself I would consider it to be the same thing.

1688. Do you remember a case coming before Mr. Fogarty of a person claiming in the liberal interest to register out of a house or room of which he was not in possession or in occupation, but which room was held by his mother or some other relative, claiming by title paramount?—I believe there was such a case as that came before Mr. Fogarty. I remember a case like it occurring in Belfast, where the person who claimed had the greater part of the house. Another person had under a will or some other title a portion of that house by a title paramount to that of the claimant, and that claimant had applied previously for registry in Belfast and was rejected, and my recollection is that Mr. Fogarty also rejected him.

1689. Then Mr. Fogarty held that it was necessary for the claimant to have occupation of the entire house, in what he considered to be the parliamentary sense of the word "occupation," by himself or lodgers?—He required that the party should have the occupation of the house by himself or by lodgers; that there should be no party occupying it who had a title paramount.

1690. Is not the question of the lodger point one which must have arisen in a great many cases at other places besides Belfast?—Yes, it must have attracted the attention of many, no doubt.

1691. From the manner in which all the towns in Ireland are occupied, have you any doubt that a number of persons in all the towns sending members to Parliament must have had houses part of which were let to lodgers, and the occupants of which came forward to register?—No doubt.

1692. Can you state where the point first arose?—The question as to the right of persons having lodgers in their houses to register, first arose, I think, in Belfast, in April sessions, 1835.

1693. It did not then depend upon Mr. Fogarty's rejecting a party a portion of whose house was let to lodgers, whether or not that question should be decided upon appeal, because the question must have arisen elsewhere as well as in Belfast?—It certainly could not be decided by appeal as far as the borough of Belfast was concerned, unless Mr. Fogarty would reject an applicant.

1694. But the question could be brought before the judges from any other place as well as from the town of Belfast?—If it had been brought under the consideration of the registering barrister.

1695. And from its nature it was a question not likely to be confined to Belfast?—Certainly not; but if all the other barristers acted upon the same principle as Mr. Fogarty and refused, appeal on the questions would be for ever precluded from the consideration of the judges.

1696. But if there was a difference of opinion among the barristers, an appeal must have taken place?—Yes, it would come before them upon a difference of opinion.

1697. And it could not but have come before them from some of the towns?—It must have arisen in some of them.

1698. Has it arisen in other towns; in Dublin, for example?—Yes, in Dublin it has arisen.

1699. *Chairman.*] Did it arise in Dublin before or after the time you have mentioned?—It did not arise in Dublin till more than a year after Mr. Fogarty's refusal to reject the party who was willing to consent to be rejected; and if he had been rejected the question would have been decided one way or the other long since.

1700. *Mr. O'Connell.*] But you yourself have said, that you did not know of any barrister except Mr. Dobbs, who is not an assistant barrister, but a deputy, that has not acted upon it in the same way as Mr. Fogarty?—I do not know what their practice has been.

1701. *Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.*] You stated that the effect of Mr. Fogarty's decision with respect to the lodger point would be more prejudicial to the conservative interest than beneficial. Would it not be so merely by its effect in enlarging the franchise, or lowering the standard?—The effect of the decision upon the conservative interest arises from the admission of that class of persons, generally in a humble rank of life, who take lodgers, but it does not follow from that, that a general lowering of the franchise, so as to extend it to all persons occupying a house of a particular value, would have the same effect. The class of persons who take lodgers may, in a borough, be more numerous with one party

Mr. John Bates.

13 March 1837.

than with another party; but that may not be the case in reference to the number of persons who occupy houses of a low value.

1702. You were understood in a former answer to state, that the fact of taking lodgers showed that the party was in a humbler condition of life than he would be in if he held the same house without taking lodgers—Generally speaking, it is evidence of that. There may be exceptions of persons, who, for the sake of making money, take lodgers; but as a general rule it is so.

1703. And that it was by letting in that inferior class of persons that the conservative interest was damaged?—By letting in a class of persons who from their political anxiety would club together to take houses, and to occupy them by their friends as lodgers.

1704. Mr. O'Connell.] Which is the very inconvenience mentioned by Lord Hardwicke, and answered by him?—Lord Hardwicke does mention that inconvenience.

1705. And answers it?—Yes.

1706. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] Then you are understood to say, that you consider that the conservative interest would be damaged by the lowering the franchise, so as to let in an inferior class of persons?—No, I have not stated that, I have stated the reverse. I have stated, that there is a larger number of that particular description of persons who take lodgers in Belfast, of the radical than of the conservative party.

1707. That is an accidental circumstance?—It is a circumstance of the town; and I know that as far as the rejections went formerly, upon the ground of parties having lodgers, there were more of the other party rejected than of our party, and it is from that data chiefly that I speak.

1708. You stated, that lowering the franchise in itself would not be prejudicial to the conservative interest at Belfast. You consider then that the persons whom the lowering of the standard would let in, would consist more of conservatives than of liberals?—I think so.

1709. Would the persons of the conservative party who would be so let in, be of equal, or of superior, or of an inferior grade to those persons who have the qualification with lodgers?—The parties who have lodgers in Belfast, occupying houses of various values, from 5*l.* up to 50 *l.*, are more numerous on the part of the radicals, in my opinion, than on the part of the conservative interest, and, therefore, I do not think that the questions as to the lowering of the franchise, and the letting in of lodgers, have any close connexion.

1710. Can you account for how it happens that the persons who let lodgings in Belfast, should be principally of the liberal interest; are they more hospitable?—The hospitality of a man that lets lodgings is of a very questionable character; I think it is from the necessity they are under, generally, of making their livelihood in that way. I speak from the fact, that during the time when there were rejections in Belfast, on the ground of houses being let in lodgings, there were many more rejections on the radical than on the conservative side; that is the fact from which I draw my conclusion.

1711. But so far as that decision of Mr. Fogarty's goes, it does extend the franchise?—It does, certainly.

1712. Is there any decision of Mr. Fogarty's that you complain of which does not extend the franchise?—Our great complaint is, that Mr. Fogarty extends the franchise much beyond what was contemplated by the Reform Act.

1713. That is the gravamen of your complaint?—That is what we feel aggrieved by; we wish the franchise to be dispensed liberally according to what we consider the meaning of the Reform Act; but we consider that Mr. Fogarty has extended it much beyond that.

1714. In every one of the points, in respect of which you complain of his decisions, it is that his decision lets in a class that your construction excludes?—That is the ground on which we complain of his admissions; there are some of his rejections of which also we complain.

1715. The question does not refer to individual cases, but is there any one of his rules of construction which you complain of, which does not go to enlarge the franchise?—Yes, there is a rule of construction which Mr. Fogarty laid down in the January Sessions of 1837, in the case of Robert Moore, of Ballynacarrick, Belfast; Moore claimed to register out of a house of which he had been in occupation for six months, but it appeared that there was a back-house belonging to

to the same tenant, also in his occupation, and that he had changed his back-house into a parlour and opened an internal communication; Mr. Fogarty considered that, in consequence of this alteration, the identity of his house was altered, and refused him, on the ground, that the house out of which he claimed to register, had not been six months in existence.

1716. Then, what Mr. Fogarty decided in that case was, that owing to the alteration in that back part of the premises, it was not the identical house of which he had been in possession for six months?—The decision was, that the house out of which he then claimed to register, was not the same house which he had occupied for six months; and we maintained, that it was the same house.

1717. Do you know the case of Magee, which was decided by Mr. Fogarty the day before at the same sessions?—I do.

1718. Magee was a liberal, and he was rejected?—He was.

1719. Do you recollect the facts of that case?—On referring to the clerk of the peace's list, I see he was admitted; but my recollection is, that he was rejected by Mr. Fogarty; and I give Mr. Fogarty the full benefit of the rejection.

1720. Was not he rejected upon the same principle upon which Moore was rejected?—He was; the improvements in Magee's house appeared to have been made within two months, and Mr. Fogarty laid it down, that if those had been merely improvements of an old house he would register him, but that in this case it was the addition of a new house to an old one, and therefore he must reject the claim.

1721. The report of that case is as follows, in the *Ulster Times*:—"Pat. Magee, of Millfield, spectacle-maker, claimed to register. He pays 14*l.* rent. Cross-examined by Mr. Whiteside. In fact he has three houses, and one of them, with a part of another, is set; pays 14*l.* for all the three; has been offered 10*l.* for the one he lives in, because of the improvements he has made; the improvements are not two months finished. Mr. Whiteside argued, that this claim could not be allowed; he had not been in possession six months, for he had admitted that he had not completed the improvements two months. The barrister questioned the claimant as to the nature of the improvements; and it appeared that they consisted in the erection of a house at the rear of the one in which the claimant resides. Mr. Fogarty then said, he could not register him; if the improvements had been merely improvements of the old house he would have registered him at once; but they were as an addition of a new house to the old one, and therefore he must reject the claim." Now can you distinguish that principle from Moore's case?—That case appears to me to involve the same principle as Moore's case.

1722. The principle that pervades both is, that the dwelling-house, out of which a man seeks to register, must substantially have had existence for six months before the registry?—The ground of the decision in both cases was, that the house had not existed for six months. The barrister's view of it was, that the house had not existed. We contended the house had existed, and that the addition of a parlour to the house did not destroy the identity of it. I will read to the Committee the argument that appears here in the case of Robert Moore, whose rejection I have referred to.

1723. That argument is by Mr. Whiteside?—Mr. Whiteside objected to the registration of Magee, not on the ground that the identity of his house was changed, but on the ground that his house had not been worth 10*l.* for six months last past. Mr. Whiteside contended, that the man must occupy a house for the whole period of six months, worth 10*l.*, and that is the meaning of this argument, in the case of Magee. "Mr. Whiteside argued, that this claim could not be allowed; he had not been in possession six months, for he had admitted that he had not completed the improvements two months." The principle that had been set upon in the borough of Belfast, was this, that the house, out of which the claimant sought to register, must have been worth 10*l.* for six months past, and that was the objection which we urged against Magee. However, Mr. Fogarty decided upon Magee's rejection upon a different ground, namely, the non-existence of the house for six months; but the case of Robert Moore, which has been referred to, is this: "Robert Moore, of Ballymacarrett, applied to register out of his house, for which he stated that he pays 8*l.* rent; he has a garden. Barrister: As I have no taxes in Ballymacarrett to guide me in judging of the value, I must require corroboratory evidence in this case. Mr. Whiteside then made it appear, by the evidence of the claimant, that since he got the place he has added two rooms to it; one of them is finished above six months, and the other not more than one month. The

Mr. John Bates.

13 March 1837.

Barrister: I cannot register him; it is like the other cases: repairs or improvements are very different from additions to the superficial extent of the house; by additions its identity is changed. Claimant, to Mr. Whiteside: I can go into the new room, which is six months finished, without going out of the house. Mr. Whiteside said, he was not inclined to enter upon the disputes of philosophers about identity; but he could not see the justice of his worship's remarks about the change of the identity; he could easily conceive that changing a dwelling-house into a warehouse, for example, would be changing its identity. Mr. Fogarty: Its character would be changed in that case; but its identity would remain. Now, Mr. Whiteside, let me ask you, if a man added two houses to one, could I register him out of that one house, before he had been in possession six months? Mr. Whiteside: That is not the case; but suppose I add a conservatory or a kitchen to a house, is it not still the same house; need I remain till I have had the kitchen or conservatory six months before I can register? But this man says, he has had the room six months. [To claimant.] Is your house worth 10*l.* without the room? Barrister: Oh! he must include the room; he can't register out of part of a house; he must register out of the entire house; he must be in possession of that house for six months; the two rooms are part of it, and he has not been in possession of one of them above one month; he therefore has not been in possession of that house for the time required. Claimant, to Mr. Whiteside: Before these rooms were used as rooms, they were attached to the building, and were used for cows. Mr. Whiteside again urged the right of claimant to be admitted. The barrister said, he should only stultify himself if he did admit him. He could not. Mr. Whiteside: Why really your worship's view of the case would imply, that if I add to my house, and thereby increase its value, I lose my franchise if I am registered out of it. Barrister: I think so (a suppressed laugh). Mr. Whiteside: If a man a short time before a registry suddenly increases a 2*l.* house to a 10*l.* house, I would not say he should be registered. Barrister: Reject this man. Mr. Whiteside: We will appeal in this case. Mr. Fogarty, in reply to the clerk of the peace, said, he was to be rejected for want of value, and for not having been in possession for six months."

1724. Is the entire of that report accurate?—I was present on the occasion, and from my recollection of it, (and I certainly was a good deal surprised by the principles laid down by the barrister,) the report is accurate, and I state that surprise as the reason why it fixed itself upon my memory.

1725. "Claimant, to Mr. Whiteside: Before these rooms were used as rooms, they were attached to the building, and were used for cows;" is that correct?—It did appear in evidence that these rooms were used by the claimant as a cow-house, and that they formed part of his holding or tenement.

1726. As a cow-house?—As a cow-house.

1727. The new rooms in that particular case were mentioned when the inquiry was as to the value of the house?—Yes; one room was stated to have been there six months previously, and it was proposed to prove that that house, with the room, was of the value of 10*l.*; Mr. Fogarty did not think it necessary for us to go into that evidence.

1728. It was upon an inquiry as to the value that the fact of the two rooms having been built was mentioned, and then Mr. Fogarty stated, that the principle upon which he had decided the former case, appeared to him to rule that?—Yes.

1729. That former case had been decided against the liberal interest?—Yes.

1730. Mr. Whiteside being counsel in it?—Mr. Whiteside being counsel in opposition, but opposing the case upon the other ground I have mentioned, namely, that it had not been worth 10*l.* for six months previously, in the character of a dwelling-house.

1731. *Chairman.*] Is there any reason given by the barrister for his rejection of the case of Magee?—The barrister's judgment is reported thus: "Mr. Fogarty then said he could not register him; if the improvements had been merely improvements of the old house, he would have registered him at once, but they were as an addition of a new house to the old one, and therefore he must reject the claim."

1732. Referring to the clause in the Reform Act, wherein the barrister is required to give his reasons for rejection, did he comply with that clause of the Reform Act in the case of Magee?—I have stated that in the case of Magee it appears in the clerk of the peace's list that Magee was admitted; but I am quite satisfied that that entry is an error, because the man was rejected.

1733. Is there in that document, to your knowledge, any note or memorandum whatever

whatever with reference to this case?—Nothing whatever, except that he is admitted. The entry is, "allowed."

1734. Mr. O'Connell.] With reference to the case of Moore, what is the entry in the book?—The entry in the clerk of the peace's list is, that the house has not been six months in existence, and that it is not value; but as to value, we proposed to prove the house with the one room that had been altered six months previously, to be of value.

1735. In your opinion, is the entry of that nature as will enable the claimant in Moore's case to make an appeal?—Yes; we gave notice of an appeal in that case, and it was intended to try it with the other appeal of Hannay, to which I have referred before; but in consequence of Hannay's appeal not being in a state to be tried, I am doubtful whether any of the appeals will be tried.

1736. Are the assizes going on at this time?—They were going on at the latter end of last week.

1737. But you have had no intelligence of what passed there?—I have not.

1738. Mr. O'Connell.] But Magee the liberal cannot appeal, because it is entered "allowed." No, he cannot appeal.

1739. The conservative has appealed?—The conservative gave notice of appeal.

1740. Is not that appealing?—Yes.

1741. Mr. Lefroy.] Will not Magee be put upon the poll in consequence of that entry?—I do not know how that fact may be. It will depend upon whether he has taken the affidavit, and whether a certificate is issued to him or not.

1742. If he lodges an affidavit, is not he entitled then to call for a certificate?—I do not know, under such peculiar circumstances, what the claimants' rights would be.

1743. Mr. O'Connell.] Surely you know that the affidavit is to be made at the time of the registry?—Yes; he must make the affidavit at the time of the registry.

1744. And he did not make an affidavit?—I think not.

1745. He could not make it after the session?—He must make it at the time of the registry.

1746. Mr. E. Tennent.] Are you aware of any other class of claimants with respect to whom an analogous alteration had taken place in the premises out of which they sought to be registered during the six months prior to their appearing at the sessions?—Yes, there was another claimant whose case appeared to me to be analogous; but Mr. Fogarty drew a distinction between it and the cases referred to. It was the case of John Prunty: "John Prunty, of Institation-place, holds a house for which he pays five shillings taxes and two pounds two shillings rent. He built the house himself. He was cross-examined by Mr. Whiteside, and it appeared that some of the improvements in the yard had not been finished six months. Mr. Fogarty said he would admit him; if the new buildings had been as an addition to the house, he would not; but as they were in the yard, and detached from the house, he would. He then asked the claimant if the premises, as they now stand, were worth 10 l. ?—Claimant. They are.—Mr. Whiteside first read the seventh section of the Reform Bill, and argued against the impropriety of adopting such a standard for ascertaining a qualification. If that were to be acted on, a man in a case such as this, where the premises were not annually of the value of 10 l., had only to build up a place in his yard one day, and he might go and register the next. It was clearly in opposition to the Act, which required a *bona fide* occupancy of premises of the clear yearly value of 10 l. for six months. How could a man occupy or possess that which did not exist? The claim allowed."

1747. Do you recollect any case where the distinction drawn by the harrister rested upon the improvement being detached from the house?—It rested upon the circumstance, that there had been no internal communication opened.

1748. Do you recollect what the improvement was?—The improvement was, the party having enlarged a pig-house that was in the rear of his dwelling-house, into a cow-house. There was a pig-house immediately in the rear of his house, which he had within six months altered into a cow-house. That alteration had made up his house, including this cow-house, to be of the value of 10 l., and Mr. Fogarty conceived that it did not alter the identity of his house, and that he was entitled to be registered.

1749. Upon what grounds did Mr. Fogarty draw that distinction? Was it because there was no communication between the new house and the old?—As well as I could collect it, it was because there had been no internal communication. If this cow-house, in place of being a cow-house, had been altered into a parlour, and an inside door opened, I do not conceive he would have registered the claimant.

Mr. John Bates.

13 March 1837.

Mr. John Estlin.

13 March 1837.

1750. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you mean that there was no new internal communication?—The point did not turn upon the newness of the internal communication, but upon the identity of the man's house being altered.

1751. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Was it this, that the superficial extent of the house was not changed?—The superficial extent is stated as the ground in one of these cases.

1752. Was it not the fact that the superficial extent of the house was not increased, but the superficial extent of the dwelling-house remained the same?—The dwelling-house; but the pig-house, which had been altered into a cow-house, I think had been enlarged.

1753. Are you sure of that?—No; I do not state it as certain.

1754. If it was not enlarged, you say that the superficial extent of the dwelling was not increased by the alteration?—The superficial extent of the place that the man actually dwelt in.

1755. Of neither place?—If the pig-house was not increased I believe that the superficial extent of neither was increased, but I believe the pig-house was enlarged for cows.

1756. Chairman.] Do you mean to say that your apprehension of the decision of Mr. Fogarty, with reference to this class of cases, was this, that supposing a person having lived in a house worth 50*l.* a year, and having complied with all the other requisites as to the payment of taxes and so forth, had within the preceding six months made that house by improvements worth another 50*l.* a year, that that man would be disfranchised?—Most unquestionably if he added a building to his house and opened an internal communication with it, Mr. Fogarty's view appeared to me that he would not register that person.

1757. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] That is to say, if he enlarged the superficial extent of the house?—Yes.

1758. Mr. Emerson Tenent.] Did not Mr. Whiteside put the case, if he had added a conservatory to the drawing-room window?—That case was put, and Mr. Fogarty assented to the doctrine, as I understood him, that if there was such an addition as that it would destroy the identity of the house; the identity of the house was the ground of his decision.

1759. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you recollect upon what case that was laid down?—It occurs in the argument on the case of Robert Moore, which I read before.

1760. Mr. Whiteside was putting a supposed case there?—He was.

1761. And the barrister was applying himself to it as a supposed case?—Yes.

1762. Do you recollect that the barrister took this distinction, that if the addition was for the purpose of habitation he would consider it an enlargement of the superficial extent of the house and as altering its identity, but if it were not for purposes of habitation, as a conservatory, for instance, that he would not consider it as altering its identity?—I do not recollect that distinction being laid down, but the two grounds, as well as I could gather them, because I had a great deal of difficulty in understanding the distinction myself, were these, that the house was not the same; that was the primary objection, that the identity of the house was lost, and that the superficial extent was increased.

1763. Was there not a sub-distinction, namely, that although the superficial extent was increased, as in the special case of a conservatory being added to the drawing-room, still as that conservatory would not have been erected for purposes of habitation, but merely for the purposes of ornament, the barrister considered that the enlargement of the superficial extent of the house in that manner did not alter its identity?—I do not recollect Mr. Fogarty putting forward that view; I certainly cannot venture to give any opinion upon it, because I consider that the principle is altogether wrong; I think if a man occupies a house worth 10*l.* for six months, or for twelve months, it is no matter what alterations he has made to increase the value of the house, provided he does not decrease it below 10*l.*

1764. But will you now apply yourself to the distinction between the two cases of an enlargement of the superficial extent of a house for purposes of habitation, to be used as a habitation, and an enlargement for any other purpose, say for ornament, as the case of a veranda or conservatory?—Differing from the judgment of Mr. Fogarty, I cannot see how either of them would bear upon it; I would consider that the adding of a matter of ornament to a house formed part of the house.

1765. Do not you see the distinction between an addition made for purposes of ornament or for gardening purposes, and an addition made for purposes of habitation?—I cannot see any distinction under the Reform Act.

1766. Putting

1766. Putting the Reform Act out of the question, do you see a distinction between those two cases?—I can see that the circumstances are different.

1767. Do you see a distinction?—I do see a distinction.

1768. Seeing that distinction, can you suppose that that distinction operated on the mind of the barrister; that he made that distinction whether he so expressed it or not?—I cannot.

1768*. You see a distinction?—I see a difference in the circumstances, but I cannot for the life of me see how it would affect this question.

1769. You have already stated that you see a distinction between an addition made to a house for purposes of habitation, and an addition made not for purposes of habitation, but for purposes of ornament.—I see a distinction in the thing done, but I cannot see any substantial distinction as to the law of the matter.

1770. You see a distinction; may not the barrister, in adjudicating this case, have seen the same distinction that you do?—He may have seen it; the distinction that I see is, that whereas the alteration in the one case is into a habitation, in the other it is into a conservatory; but I do not see any other distinction in the matter. I cannot see how it affects the question, provided the man dwells in the house previously.

1771. Do you mean to say this, that you do not know that a conservatory is not used for purposes of habitation?—I do.

1772. Then there is that distinction, that a conservatory is not used for purposes of habitation, whereas the enlargement of the superficial extent which occurred in the real case, was an enlargement for purposes of habitation?—Yes.

1773. Then there is that distinction between the supposed case of a conservatory and the real case as it occurred, namely, that the enlargement in the one case was for the purposes of habitation, and in the other case not?—Yes.

1774. Where a man came to register out of a dwelling-house, do not you consider that it was the business of the barrister to consider what portion of the structure, whatever it may be called, was, properly speaking, a dwelling-house, and what portion of it was not?—In my opinion, if the applicant dwells in the house from which he notices, it is immaterial how much of the *soil* worth from which he claims to register is composed of the actual dwelling, and how much is composed of stables or cow-houses attached to it.

1775. Mr. Fogarty's view of it was what you have stated, namely, that in the case supposed he would consider that the conservatory did not constitute any part of the dwelling?—Mr. Fogarty's view was, that by reason of adding a building that had formerly been a cow-house, changing it into a parlour, and opening an internal communication, the identity of the house was altered, and therefore he could not register it.

1776. Mr. Emerson Tennent.] So far as your recollection serves you, was not the principle laid down by the barrister this, that additions or improvements, no matter how much they increased the value of the house, provided they did not add to its superficial extent, were not sufficient to defeat the franchise, but that if the superficial extent of the house was increased by those additions, then the franchise was defeated?—I believe that to have been his opinion.

1777. Mr. O'Connell.] What do you believe to have been his opinion?—As I stated before, that he chiefly rested upon the circumstance of an internal communication having been opened, as well as upon the increase or diminution of the superficial extent. Those were the two principles, as far as I could understand them, on which his opinion was founded.

1778. Mr. Emerson Tennent.] In your opinion, the adding a conservatory would be a change in the superficial extent?—Yes, if it was on the ground floor.

1779. Are you aware that the barrister ever drew or stated in court the distinction between its being a habitable addition to the house, and its being an uninhabitable one?—Certainly not; I have no recollection of any such view having been brought forward, and my recollection is, that it was not.

1780. Supposing that instead of making a conservatory, any other room, occupied occasionally in a similar degree, such as a picture gallery, had been added, which would have equally changed the superficial extent, do you conceive that that would have altered the case?—My conception was, that if the picture gallery had communicated by internal communication, and increased the superficial extent, the applicant would have been rejected.

1781. And the barrister never drew the distinction whether it was occupied as a portion of the residence of the family, or not?—Not to my recollection.

Mr. John Bates.

13 March 1897.

1782. The great question depended upon the connexion of the new building with the old, and the increase of the superficial extent?—Yes.

1783. Then suppose that this addition made to the premises did not in the first instance communicate with the house, as in the case where the cow-house was altered into a parlour; and suppose a covered way had been made from the house to the new addition; do you conceive that that would have been such an alteration and increase of the superficial extent as would have come within his purview, and defeated the claim to register?—If a covered way had been opened from the dwelling-house to the cow-house, I would consider, certainly, under Mr. Fogarty's decision, that that would have changed the identity of the house.

1784. If the man passed from the dwelling-house to the cow-house in the open air, then he would have a right to be registered; but if he passed from the dwelling-house to the cow-house by a covered way, his claim would be defeated?—A communication in that way would, as I understood it, have defeated his claim.

1785. Mr. Attorney-General [for Ireland.] Was not the ground upon which Mr. Fogarty proceeded, that the house must be the same identical one?—Yes.

1786. Then the only difference between you and Mr. Fogarty was, that you would have established a different rule, for the purpose of ascertaining the identity, from that which he adopted?—Mr. Fogarty entertained one view as to the identity of a house, and I entertained another.

1787. Will you state in what the identity of a house consists?—As to the question of the identity of a house, while I am here in London, considerable improvements are making on my house and offices at home, and I certainly shall consider that house the same when I get home as I considered it when I left it.

1788. Mr. Serjeant Ball. Will you try to state wherein consists the identity of a house?—I would honestly take the identity of a house to be the fact, that it is the same house that it previously was; that is to say, if there have been no such circumstance as, for instance, making two houses into one; I would consider a change of identity to be produced by a thing of that kind, but I would not consider the adding a small portion to a house a destruction of its identity. However, it is much easier to describe what would not change the identity of a house, than to settle the principles of identity.

1789. You are aware that there is great difficulty in laying down, as a general rule, what shall be considered as constituting the identity of any object, either a living animal, or even an inanimate substance?—There may be differences of opinion upon that subject, and are, no doubt.

1790. For instance, if you have a house of which you take down a room this year, and build another room in its place, you consider the house so altered to be the same house?—Yes, I do.

1791. If the next year you take down another room, and build another room in its place, you will also consider it to be the same house?—Yes.

1792. If you go through the whole house in that way, so as to substitute a complete set of rooms for the original rooms, will it continue to be the same house in a succession of years?—The case put is a very extreme one; but I would say that it would continue to be the same house, provided it stood upon the original ground; that the mere altering from year to year, although the alteration involved the removal of the brick-work, would not prevent its being substantially, in the plain meaning of the word, the same house.

1793. Before Mr. Fogarty made the distinction with regard to the lodger part, if an addition had been built to a house, and that addition had been let to lodgers, the addition opening by internal communication so as to constitute part of the dwelling-house, would you have considered the tenant of that part entitled to be registered; that is, in the case of his having made an addition to the house, the original house being worth 10*l.* a year, and the additional part occupied by lodgers?—I would consider that the applicant should be rejected, upon Mr. Mayne's view of the case, which was, that the setting of any portion of the house to lodgers destroyed the franchise; and I would conceive that the opening an internal communication had certainly added the new building to the house, and destroyed the exclusive occupation, the necessity for which appeared to be the reason of the rejection.

1794. An exclusive occupation of the whole house?—Yes.

1795. And he not having exclusive occupation of the new part?—Yes.

1796. You would consider the new part in that view of the case as a portion of the tenement out of which he was going to register?—Certainly.

1797. In

1797. In case of there being no lodgers, would you consider the new part as a portion of a tenement, out of which he was going to register?—If the party came forward not having lodgers, and if his house was value without that addition, I would consider him entitled to register. If it was not value without that addition, I would consider him not entitled to register.

1798. Suppose a party coming forward to register, there having been an addition to the house, the original building being worth 10*l.* a year, would you consider him as registering out of the new building, or merely out of the old dwelling-house?—I would consider it the same dwelling-house.

1799. If the new part was occupied by lodgers, would not that have excluded him?—Yes, because that new part formed part of a house.

1800. Then if it formed part of the house out of which he was to register, it is clear that when that new part has been built within six months, you cannot predicate that he has been in possession of the house for six months?—Provided that the rest of it was of 10*l.* value, then he has been in possession of 10*l.* worth.

1801. Will you assign the reason why, if the new part is occupied by lodgers, you would have excluded him, considering that new part so occupied by lodgers as part of the tenement out of which he seeks to register, whereas if it were not occupied by lodgers you would register him, although it is part of the tenement, and he has not been in possession of that tenement for six months?—The party claiming to register makes an addition to his house within the six months, he opens a communication with it, and he lets the lodgers into that portion, and, according to the view originally entertained upon the lodger point, he thereby parts with the exclusive occupation of the whole house, and therefore would have been excluded. But if he had no lodgers, had he merely increased the value of his house, I would consider him certainly entitled to register, provided the old part was worth 10*l.*

1802. But he must have been in possession for six months of the tenement out of which he seeks to register?—That I conceive is just the question that is involved in Mr. Fogarty's decisions; and all I have to say is, that no barrister has ever acted upon that principle. If the party had had 10*l.* worth of a dwelling-house, they did not exclude him because he had added rooms to that dwelling-house, because if they had, it can scarcely be conceived in how many cases it would interfere with the right of parties previous to the registry, and ultimately with the right of vote after the registry.

1803. You were understood to say that it was not sufficient that the house should be worth 10*l.* a-year, but it was necessary that it should be the identical house of which notice had been given, but that there was a difference between your view of the identity and Mr. Fogarty's view?—I do not recollect having given evidence to that effect, but my view is simply this, that the party must apply for the registry of the same house for which he has given notice, of which house he must have been in possession six months.

1804. You consider that a new building being added, does not alter the identity?—Certainly not.

1805. A new building being added, the party registering, you conceive, registers out of the same building?—I do, provided that alteration is not one of great magnitude, one that persons talking in the ordinary common sense view of the thing would say amounted to a complete alteration of the house.

1806. Then the party registering, when there has been an addition to the house according to your view, registers out of the old building?—He registers out of the house.

1807. Notwithstanding that he has not been in possession of a portion of the house as it stands, at the time of registering?—Notwithstanding that there has been a subsequent addition, which increases the value of the house, provided there has been previously 10*l.* worth.

1808. Or if the added part had been destroyed in the meantime, he retaining what he had six months ago, that being of sufficient value?—I would not consider that to destroy the identity of the house.

1809. But you would consider it as disentitling him to vote if he had let the added part to lodgers, he retaining the original part, and that being worth 10*l.* a-year?—That would be the effect of the view of the lodger point as entertained originally.

1810. So that Mr. Fogarty was bound to come to the conclusion that he did upon this point, in consistency with the conclusion that he came to upon the lodger point; they flow from the same principle?—I do not see that the principles are the same at all.

Mr. John Bates.

13 March 1837.

1811. Do not you admit that the decision come to by Mr. Fogarty respecting new buildings completely clashed with the decision come to upon the lodger point as decided by Mr. Mayne?—I do not see the bearings of the cases upon each other, and I never heard it alluded to before. Mr. Fogarty certainly did not refer to it in giving his judgment upon it, and I never heard the cases adduced before a hearing upon each other, nor can I understand what the bearings are.

1812. Did not Mr. Mayne's judgment go upon this, that the added part forms part of the dwelling-house, out of which the party seeks to register?—That the party has included it in his dwelling-house.

1813. And that the added part forms part of the thing out of which he seeks to register?—Yes.

1814. Do not you consider that a party seeking to register is bound to be in possession of the whole tenement out of which he seeks to register for six months?—No; I consider that possession of an original tenement, whether a house, a warehouse, a counting-house, or a shop, which for six months previously has been worth 10*l.*, is sufficient to entitle him to register.

1815. Mr. O'Connell.] You know the oath is that he has been in possession for six months?—Possession and actual occupation for six months.

1816. And the oath is not that they were of the value for six months, but that they are at the time of swearing?—That the premises are worth 10*l.*

1817. When Mr. Fogarty rejected them, did not he distinctly state his reasons to the clerk of the peace, whose duty it was to take down the causes of rejection?—I heard Mr. Fogarty state in court that he rejected the applicant in consequence of the identity of his house being lost.

1818. Is that what he said to the clerk of the peace?—I did not hear him say anything directly to the clerk of the peace.

1819. Will you say that he did not?—No, I will not.

1820. Look at your report, which says: "Mr. Fogarty, in reply to the clerk of the peace, said he was to be rejected for want of value, and for not having been in possession for six months."—I see that in the report.

1821. The clerk of the peace, according to his duty, asked the reasons of rejection?—Yes.

1822. Mr. Fogarty gave those reasons for rejection?—So it appears from the report.

1823. It was the duty of the clerk of the peace to take those down?—Yes, I have already stated the grounds which appear in the list of the clerk of the peace for the rejection.

1824. He did take them down according to his duty?—Yes.

1825. At this registry the first rejection upon the principle you speak of was the rejection of a liberal?—I have already stated so.

1826. Can you state how many conservatives were rejected altogether at that registry?—Seven.

1827. How many liberals?—Fourteen.

1828. How many conservatives were registered altogether?—There were, as appears from this statement, which I believe to be correct, 112.

1829. What do you call the other party?—I give them no name; I would call them radicals; I see they are called O'Connellites here; they were 114; but then it is added here, "deducting re-registries on the conservative side, 26, and that of the O'Connellites, 34; the real accession to each party on this registry stands thus:—Conservatives 86; O'Connellites 80; majority for the Constitution six."

1830. Will you state whether from the year 1833, there has not been a considerable increase of persons registered in each year since; an accumulating series?—I make the registry in 1833, two hundred and twenty-two.

1831. That was by Mr. Currie?—Yes, but the January registry was only four; the registry in 1834 was 256.

1832. That is, there were thirty-four more registered in 1834 than in 1833?—Yes.

1833. Then in 1835, by Mr. Mayne, how many were registered?—559.

1834. So that he registered in 1835 more than twice as many as had been registered in 1834?—More than twice as many.

1835. He registered 303 more in 1835 than had been registered in 1834?—Yes.

1836. In Mr. Fogarty's first year did not he register 709?—Yes.

1837. That is, he registered only 150 more in 1836 than Mr. Mayne had registered in 1835?—Yes.

1838. So

1838. So that the increase in Mr. Fogarty's year of 1836 was not one-half the increase to the registry in Mr. Mayne's year of 1835?—Yes.

1839. Have not you been stating that upon the last four registries the conservative interest has gained?—I may state that in collecting my materials to come before this Committee, I have not directed my attention to how it affects parties or individuals, but I think I can give a general reply to the question. The conservatives have, in my opinion, registered a majority at every session, with the exception of the first sessions, at which Mr. Fogarty registered, in January 1836.

1840. But at the last four sessions, in your opinion, the conservatives have had a majority?—Yes, I am convinced that the number of persons added to the registry for the first time, on the part of the conservatives, is more numerous than that on the part of the radicals.

1841. By the first time you mean, where there was no re-registry?—Yes.

1842. Did this question of identity of premises, or difference by reason of additions or improvements, arise before Mr. Currie?—No; I have no recollection of it ever having arisen before any other assistant barrister.

1843. Did you ever know it to arise before any assistant barrister except Mr. Fogarty?—No.

1844. Were you ever informed that it had arisen before any other assistant barrister?—No, I never heard of its having arisen before any other assistant barrister, or of any other assistant barrister making a similar decision.

1845. You are secretary to some body?—I have been for several years secretary to the Belfast Society.

1846. Is that a political society?—It is a political society, and a society for attending to the municipal affairs of Belfast.

1847. Upon the conservative part?—Yes.

1848. Are you a paid secretary?—No; any political services that I give my country are all gratis.

1849. Are not you paid for attending the registries?—Those are my professional services as an attorney; I am paid for them.

1850. Who is your paymaster?—The Belfast Society.

1851. That body of which you are the secretary?—Yes.

1852. In your capacity of secretary you get nothing but thanks, and in your capacity of attorney you pay yourself; that is, you are one of the body who pay you?—I am paid.

1853. You are well paid, I hope?—I consider that as a matter between me and my clients exclusively, and that I am not bound to answer this question here.

1854. Who are the leading members of the society?—It would be matter of great gratification, I am sure, to the leading members of that society to have their names recorded in the Report of this Committee; but I humbly conceive that as secretary of that society I am not bound to give evidence to a Committee for an inquiry into the registry of fictitious votes with regard to their names.

1855. Does not the society take a part upon that registry?—They do.

1856. Do not they pay an agent?—They do.

1857. Do not they pay counsel through their agent?—They do.

1858. Is it through the agent they pay him?—Through their agent.

1859. You are the agent and you are the secretary of the society, and you are asked to state who are the leading men of that society?—I submit to the Committee whether I am bound to answer that question.

1860. Mr. Hamilton.] Is your objection to answer the question on the ground of their being your clients?—My objection to answer the question is, that I do not conceive, as secretary of the society, that the Committee should call upon me to state the names of the members of that society, which information I only have from the confidential situation I hold, and which information cannot bear upon the subject of this inquiry.

1861. Mr. O'Connell.] Is it a secret society?—No.

1862. Are you under any obligation, either by oath or honour, to conceal their names?—We are under no obligation to conceal their names, and I could have no objection, upon communication with them, to give their names.

1863. Are not they perfectly well known in Belfast?—Most of them are.

1864. Mr. Lefroy.] Is your knowledge of them derived from the confidential situation you fill, as their agent?—It is, certainly.

1865. Mr. O'Connell.] Did not you know them before you were an attorney at all?—I did; but during my apprenticeship I acted as agent to the society.

Mr. John Bates.

13 March 1837.

1866. You knew them before they employed you upon this registry at all?—Yes.

1867. Then you are asked to state who are the active men of that society?—

1868. Mr. *Lefroy*.] Could you have answered that question with respect to your knowledge, or only as to your belief, unless you had been employed confidentially by this society as their agent?—I would certainly have the information as secretary apart from my situation of attorney.

1869. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Do they ever hold public meetings?—They do.

1870. They avow themselves publicly?—Yes, the members of that society have no objection, no hesitation, I am sure, themselves to avow their names, but I do humbly conceive that it is placing an individual in an awkward situation, calling upon him to record the names of those parties, though they might have no objection to it themselves. That is a matter in their own discretion.

1871. Who take the active part at public meetings, as members of your society, for instance, at the last public dinner; you had a public dinner, and the speeches were reported?—Yes.

1872. Who took the active part at the last public dinner?—The members who took an active part upon that occasion, as well as I recollect, were one of the honourable members for Belfast, Mr. Tennent.

1873. Is he a member of this society?—He has the honour of being the founder of this society.

1874. Does he fill any office in the society?—No.

1875. Who is president?—We have no president.

1876. Have you a committee?—We have.

1877. Which of the committee took a part at the public dinner?—They all interested themselves less or more, but as to speech-makers, which is the matter to which the question immediately refers, I cannot immediately recollect them; I had the honour of making a speech upon that occasion myself. I am the secretary. I believe I have a report of the speeches, and I will be happy to give the names of every speaker in it to the Committee the next day they meet, and any portion of the speeches that may be required.

1878. Were not there too many of them; did not you yourselves complain of it?—We had not too many persons present, we had just as many as we could hold, 1,158; we kept up speaking from half past six in the evening till five in the morning, we only regretted that we could not have four or five hours longer.

1879. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Had you any singing?—No.

1880. Mr. *O'Connell*.] The report you read of the proceedings at the registry was from the *Ulster Times*?—Yes, the last report I have referred to was from the *Ulster Times*.

1881. That is a party paper?—Yes.

1882. As violent as any you know?—It is as good a conservative paper as there is in the north of Ireland.

1883. Who are the proprietors of it?—The proprietors of it are I believe, Mr. George Davison, and Mr. Arbutnot Emerson.

1884. Mr. Emerson is brother to a gentleman who bears a different name?—Yes, he is brother to the honourable member for Belfast.

1885. Did you ever communicate any article to that paper, assailing Mr. Fogarty?—Never.

1886. The Committee have had a good deal of evidence upon the case of David Davison, also upon the case of a person of the name of Munce; what was the case of David Davison, adjudicated upon by Mr. Fogarty?—Mr. Fogarty decided upon the admission of Mr. Davison, provided Mr. Davison would take the affidavit.

1887. Was not that the adjudication?—It was subject to the applicant complying with what was necessary on his part, namely taking the affidavit.

1888. Did Mr. Fogarty use any words to that effect, or simply adjudicate, knowing that the law required the affidavit to be taken after his adjudication?—Mr. Fogarty decided that Mr. Davison was entitled to be admitted to be registered.

1889. In Munce's case did Mr. Fogarty ever adjudicate that Munce was entitled to be registered?—He decided that if the party would swear to the value of his horse he would register him.

1890. Do you mean to say that if after the man had sworn to the value of his horse, evidence had been adduced to contradict the man, and to prove distinctly by creditable persons, that it was not worth 3*l*., that in that case Mr. Fogarty would have registered Munce, although Munce swore to the value?—No, I think Mr. Fogarty would, under the strong evidence mentioned, have rejected him.

1891. Then

1891. Then do not you perceive that in Muncie's case he did not adjudicate till after Muncie refused to take the oath?—He showed a willingness to register the man provided he would swear to the value; the man stated that he paid 11 l. for his house, but that he was unwilling to take the affidavit of value.

1892. Therefore in this case, Mr. Fogarty did not adjudicate in his favour, but adjudicated against him, he refusing to swear that his house was of that value?—He was obliged to adjudge against him, in consequence of his not swearing that his house was of that value.

1893. Then he never adjudicated in his favour?—He could not do it.

1894. In every case where a man came to register for occupation, did not Mr. Fogarty require the man to swear to the value of the house in his own judgment before he adjudicated in his favour?—That was one of the questions put by Mr. Fogarty in every case.

1895. And that question was always put to him before he adjudicated in his favour?—Before he directed the registry.

1896. Is not that an adjudication in his favour?—It is an adjudication as far as the judge is concerned.

1897. Mr. *Lefroy*.] Are you rightly understood to say, that the result of Mr. Fogarty's decision as to the effect of alteration or addition to a house is this, that in the case you mentioned of a pig-house being changed into a cow-house, if there be no connexion between the house and the altered part, it does not prevent the person having the benefit of that as an improvement entitling him to register; but if there be a communication for the convenience of the person who is to milk the cow, then the claimant is not entitled to register?—Yes, that is Mr. Fogarty's view, provided the communication is out of the dwelling-house into the other premises.

1898. Mr. *O'Connell*.] You give that as your own opinion for Mr. Fogarty's view?—That appears to me to be the result of it.

1899. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] But in point of fact, he never decided it, because no such question came before him?—No, he was not called upon to decide whether the opening of a covered way would disqualify a man; but he did decide that the opening of an internal door into what had previously been a cow-house did disqualify the man.

1900. Then it was not the mere opening of a door, but superadded to it the circumstance of a cow-house being converted into a parlour?—Taking the cow-house into the house.

1901. And making it part of the dwelling?—I do not recollect that that question as to what the purpose of the thing was, was taken into account.

1902. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Then your objection to Mr. Fogarty's decision in that respect is, that he was too strict, and rejected improperly?—Decidedly, that he rejected a party of ours who was entitled to the franchise, and that he admitted another under circumstances in which we could not distinguish the difference. The one I refer to is the case of John Prunty, where it appeared that the house had not been of value for six months, and where we were prepared to prove it, but the person had altered a pig-house into a cow-house, and not opened an internal communication.

1903. Do you think that he did right in rejecting Magee?—I think Magee should have been rejected, but upon a different ground.

1904. Then you think that he rejected Magee, a liberal, upon a wrong ground?—I do.

1905. *Chairman*.] Can you state what number of claimants were affected by this particular decision of the barrister?—Very few have been affected yet; two persons who are registered have been affected by it, and one is affected who is placed on the registry.

1906. Then there were only three claimants that were in point of fact affected by that decision?—Yes, to whom that question applies.

1907. Mr. *O'Connell*.] And you had an opportunity of setting that right upon appeal?—We had not an opportunity of setting it right, so far as regards the admission in Prunty's case, because we cannot appeal; but if Mr. Fogarty should be wrong in excluding the man because of an addition made to his house, it being previously of the value, we have the means of redress; but if he should be wrong in registering the man who had not before 10 l. worth, but increased it to 10 l. worth within the six months, we have no such means of redress, because there can be no appeal from a registry.

Jouis, 16^e die Martii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland. Mr. Serjeant Ball. Mr. French. Mr. Milnes Gaskell. Mr. Hamilton.		Mr. Lefroy. Mr. O'Connell. Mr. J. M. O'Connell. Lord Granville Somerset. Mr. Emerson Tennent.
----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. John Bates, again called in; and further Examined.

Mr. John Bates.
 16 March 1837.

1908. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] HAVE you received any communication with regard to the judge's decisions, on appeal from Mr. Fogarty, connected with points as to which you have been asked before?—Yes, with regard to the question of actual occupation, on which I have been examined, there has been a decision.

1909. *Chairman.*] Upon what authority do you give this evidence?—Upon the authority of a letter from Mr. Joseph Napier, an Irish barrister, who was counsel in the case, the decision in which I am about to state.

1910. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Who is the judge who decided the appeal?—The Lord Chief Baron. I before mentioned to the Committee the case of John Hannay, who had been rejected, or who was intended to be rejected, for the purpose of taking the opinion of the judges upon it. That case I stated did not appear in the rejections, and under the impression that it could not be adjudicated on without the decision of the assistant barrister, I made an application to Mr. Fogarty, which I formerly detailed; I find that in my absence the parties who were acting for the conservative party in Belfast came to an arrangement with regard to the facts, as I believe, with those on the opposite side, for the purpose of bringing the question before the Lord Chief Baron, and that it has been brought before him, in the case of Mr. John Hannay, at the last assizes in Carrickfergus, which are just now going on. That case was argued before the Lord Chief Baron, by Mr. Hutton, whose hand-writing to letters to Mr. Fogarty, with reference to the Dundalk case, was proved by me; Mr. Joseph Napier appeared on behalf of the conservative party; Mr. Hutton appeared to support the claim, and Mr. Joseph Napier to oppose it. I will read that part of Mr. Napier's letter which refers to this question: "Carrickfergus, March 13th, 1837. This day the registry appeal in the case of John Hannay came on, before the Lord Chief Baron. The facts agreed upon were these: the claimant sought to register out of a dwelling-house, in which he had not personally resided, nor had any of his domestics been placed in care of it; he had workmen in it, preparing and altering it for his residence; he paid the workmen, and had the key of the outer door for six months before the sessions at which he sought to register. It was also conceded that, independent of the alterations and repairs, the house was of the requisite yearly value. Hutton argued at considerable length in favour of the claim; I attended to oppose it. The Lord Chief Baron thought the case too clear to require me to speak to it; he said that occupation was to be taken with reference to the subject matter to be occupied; that the words of the oath were, "possession and actual occupation," and that a house could only be actually occupied by the claimant using it as a dwelling-house; that he was inclined to say, that if any member of the claimant's household resided in the house, that would be sufficient; but if it were a workman, it clearly would not do. Hutton then said, that he thought the decision in the Dundalk case was in his favour. The Chief Baron said, that in that case when it first came before him it was stated by the attorney for the claimant, that the house was occupied by a domestic servant of the claimant, and that was not denied by the opposite attorney; but

but that afterwards it had been ascertained, or at least alleged, that in point of fact, the person in occupation was not a domestic servant, but a workman, and that the case stood over to have that fact ascertained; that the claimant not appearing to establish the fact, he suspended his decision till the fact should be established; he said, that having no doubt upon the case, he should at once decide that the claim should be rejected.

1911. Mr. E. Tinsent.] Are you aware how many persons have been registered under this same principle by Mr. Fogarty?—I cannot state the precise number; but I should suppose that, including the January registry 1836, and the January registry 1837, there may be between 20 and 30, to whom that objection was made.

1912. So that by the Chief Baron's decisions now, there have been between 20 and 30 fictitious voters created by the admission of that principle?—Yes, supposing my view of the number to be correct.

1913. Mr. O'Connell.] Can you make out an accurate list of those, on both sides, who you say have been so admitted?—I cannot.

1914. Could you, with the assistance of the clerk of the peace's book?—The clerk of the peace's book will give no information upon that subject, because the objection taken does not appear there at all; they appear duly registered like the other electors.

1915. Is there any means by which, before this Committee sits again, the precise number, on both sides, can be ascertained?—Not that I am aware of; I have no means; the party for whom I acted made the objection, when it appeared upon examination of the claimant, that it applied to him; but I cannot recollect the number of cases in which it was made, as I took no note of the decisions, with the exception of those in January 1836.

1916. Did not you put down in your book, "objected to," to every person to whom you objected in that way?—No, I did not; I was acting as the attorney, and I could not do it.

1917. Had you any assistant who did it?—There was no such list as that kept by us since January 1836.

1918. Do you mean to say that the precise number on both sides to whom that point applied, may not be ascertained by inquiries in Belfast?—I cannot ascertain them, and I know that they cannot be ascertained, as far as our party is concerned, from any documents I have.

1919. Or from inquiries in Belfast?—Or from inquiries from the party I am connected with. There may be documents in the possession of the other party, but of that I have no knowledge.

1920. When you spoke of 30, is that estimate or guess?—I said that during the five registries I would suppose the number to be between 20 and 30.

1921. How many of those would you say occurred last January?—I cannot state how many occurred in last January, because I only give the estimate from a general recollection.

1922. Can you state whether any one occurred in last January?—Yes, I believe they were occurring at every sessions.

1923. Can you pledge yourself to the Committee, that any one occurred in last January?—I cannot pledge myself to the matter, but I have no doubt at present that such cases must have occurred in January, and in fact at every sessions since Mr. Fogarty acted in Belfast among the large number of persons registered.

1924. Can you state how many out of that estimated number of 30 still continue in possession of their houses?—The estimated number was between 20 and 30.

1925. On both sides?—Yes.

1926. Including conservatives as well as liberals?—Conservatives and radicals. I cannot state the number of those that have since removed out of their houses. I could not do it unless I knew them.

1927. Can you state whether any one of those you include in that estimate has removed out of his house?—No, I cannot. The probability is that very few of them have removed, the period being so recent.

1928. So that by fictitious votes in the case of those who were registered in 1836, you mean premature votes, because, if they have occupied the houses since, they might have been registered?—They are fictitious votes upon the registry, because placed there before they had a right to be placed there.

1929. Mr. French.] You only term them fictitious votes, because they were not

Mr. John Bates.

16 March 1837.

Mr. John Bates.

16 March 1837.

in actual occupation for six months?—Because they were not in actual occupation for six months.

1930. So that those men who you state were improperly registered by Mr. Fogarty, could, in the June sessions, as a matter of course, have been registered, admitting them to be good in every other respect?—No doubt they could, when the fall period arrived; but if the Chief Baron's decision be right, they had no right to be placed there when they were.

1931. Mr. Lefroy.] How can you take upon you to say that it appeared in those cases that they became actual occupants after the six months; because a person may have workmen in the house for six months with the intention to occupy and yet never become an occupant? Did it appear in those cases that the persons who were registered upon the ground of having workmen in the house, or having the key of the house during the six months afterwards, became for six months actual occupants?—No, it did not appear that they did become for six months actual occupants, but they must be actual occupants for some period. In all the cases to which I am referring now, they were actual occupants for a less period than six months. That was the objection made to them, that before they had been actual occupants for six months they may have left their houses, and in that case they would not have had any right to be placed upon the register in respect of the premises for which they were registered.

1932. Mr. French.] At the time of the registration were they not in actual occupation?—They were.

1933. Mr. O'Connell.] So that in all the cases which Mr. Fogarty decided upon this subject, the man was then admitted to be in actual occupation at the time of the registry?—Yes; but not for six months previously.

1934. And then you know they must continue in occupation for six months after the registry before they could vote?—They must continue in occupation for six months before they could vote, certainly; but those parties might remove out of their houses after the registry, and, as was the case at the January registry in 1835, they may come up to vote upon those certificates which they have obtained.

1935. Might not that occur in every case as well as in the case you describe?—Certainly; but they have got the opportunity of committing this fraud, if it should be a fraud, by means of being placed upon the register.

1936. Mr. E. Tenant.] In the case of the present appellants Humay, he has now to serve a fresh notice, and to come up now in order to be registered?—I am so informed.

1937. Consequently all those 20 or 30 persons would likewise, had this principle been applied to them, have had to have served fresh notices after the decision, and to have come up to be regularly registered?—Yes.

1938. Chairman.] That is according to the Chief Baron's opinion, and also supposing that they have completed the six months' residence subsequent to the commencement of their occupation?—Yes.

1939. Mr. E. Tenant.] The Chief Baron has decided that the occupation of a house by his own paid workmen is not a sufficient occupation under the act?—Yes.

1940. Do you remember any case in which Mr. Fogarty admitted a man to register upon the ground of occupation where the workmen were not even his own workmen, but put into the house by another person for the purpose of repairing it?—No; I do not recollect such a case. In the case of Mr. James Greer Bell there had been workmen paid by the landlord repairing the house, but it appeared that Mr. Bell had subsequently workmen of his own in the house at a period of six months before the registry, but originally the workmen were the landlord's.

1941. Mr. O'Connell.] By a contract with the tenant the landlord was to put it into repair for him?—It was stated that the workmen who were in the first instance in the house were the landlord's, repairing the place for the tenant.

1942. Mr. French.] But you state that the time occupied by those workmen was not counted in the six months?—That is my recollection, but that the time occupied by Mr. Bell's workmen was counted.

1943. Mr. E. Tenant.] Having attended at the registrations in Belfast from 1832, are you able to state what the principle was upon which Mr. O'Dwyer acted with regard to the requisite evidence as to value?—Mr. O'Dwyer estimated the value of the house according to what the house would bring in the market. The principle upon which Mr. O'Dwyer acted is so clearly stated in a letter that I observed lately in the Northern Whig of the 15th of November, 1832, written by

Lord

Lord Stanley, who was then Secretary for Ireland, that I would beg leave to read that letter to the Committee. A question occurred at the registry in the city of Derry, where the assistant-barrister was of opinion that the claimant should have a profit of 10*l.* a year out of his house to entitle him to register. That opinion was objected to, and a memorial or letter was forwarded to Mr. Secretary Stanley, from Derry, by Mr. George Robert Dawson on the part of some of the inhabitants, and this is Lord Stanley's reply to Mr Dawson's communication.

1944. Mr. O'Connell.] Have you Mr. Dawson's communication?—I have not. I will read the whole of the extract as it appears in the Northern Whig of the 15th of November, 1832.

1945. Chairman.] What are the politics of the Northern Whig?—I would say that the Northern Whig is radical. "The 10 *l.* franchise.—The following letter has been addressed by Mr. Secretary Stanley to the Right Honourable George Dawson, in reply to the statements made by the inhabitants of Derry, with respect of the conduct of Mr. Hamilton, the registering barrister: 'Phoenix Park, Nov. 5, 1832. My dear sir,—I have this morning received your letter, together with the memorial of the inhabitants of Derry, on the subject of the construction put by the registering barrister on the 10 *l.* householder qualification. In ordinary cases I should feel great delicacy in interfering in any way, but this is a point of such vital importance that I have had no hesitation in submitting the whole of the documents to the Attorney-General, and have requested his opinion of the matter. I only write in case he should not be able, as I have requested he will do if possible, to send his opinion by this day's post. The words of the Irish Act in this case are precisely similar to the English, and you are certainly entitled to my full testimony, as to the intentions of the government and of the legislature. It is understood on all hands that the householder suffrage did not depend upon the profit or advantage which the claimant derived out of his holding, but upon the occupation of a house of a certain class, the being able to pay for which would appear to be the test of his filling a certain station in society, which would entitle him to exercise the franchise; I have no hesitation therefore in saying that the intention of the government was, to give the right to the occupier of every house, worth (not to him, but intrinsically worth) 10 *l.* a year, that the payment of such rent by the occupier was considered *prima facie* evidence of the premises being of that value, and that a person who paid a rent even exceeding the real value of the house in the market, (provided the real value were above 10 *l.*) was supposed to be qualified to vote in right of his occupation. If the legal construction of the Act be different, all I can say is, that in both England and Ireland we have completely failed in expressing our object, but I cannot but hope that Mr. Hamilton, upon re-consideration, will take a different view of this question, which, so far as I know, has not yet been raised in any other instance. You will of course understand me as only expressing my own opinion of the meaning of the Act, founded upon what I know to have been the intention, and not as presuming to offer any judgment on the soundness of Mr. Hamilton's legal view of the case. Believe me, my dear sir, yours sincerely,

'To Right hon. G. R. Dawson.' E. G. Stanley.'

1946. Mr. O'Connell.] Is not Mr. Hamilton of conservative politics?—I am utterly ignorant of what Mr. Hamilton's politics are; indeed I do not know who Mr. Hamilton is.

1947. Mr. E. Tennant.] You conceive that the principle laid down in the letter of Lord Stanley, that the house must be intrinsically of the marketable value of 10 *l.* and not an adventitious value to the individual, was the one acted upon by Mr. O'Dwyer?—Yes, the view expressed in that letter of Mr. Stanley's was the one acted upon, and one in which both parties appeared to acquiesce at the registry. Mr. O'Dwyer took the rent that the party paid, generally speaking, as *prima facie* evidence of the value of the house, unless it was proved to him that the party paid more than the value of the house, on the one hand, or unless, on the other hand, it appeared that the party had a lease, or had made valuable improvements upon the premises, in which case he took into account the yearly value at which those improvements ought to be estimated. Generally speaking, Mr. O'Dwyer admitted all claimants who paid 10 *l.* a year rent; and he also took in the aid of the police valuation which exists in Belfast. Where the house appeared to be valued in the police books at 8 *l.* a year, he considered that as *prima facie* evidence that the house was worth 10 *l.* But where the party paid less than 10 *l.* rent, or where his valuation in the police books was less than 8 *l.*, he required evidence of the value to be given by the applicant. He also required the applicant to prove the value of his

Mr. John Bates.

16 March 1837.

Mr. John Bates.

16 March 1837.

house in those cases in which evidence was produced in opposition to the claimant sufficient to raise a doubt in his (Mr. O'Dwyer's) mind with regard to the value of the house. And generally speaking, where conflicting evidence appeared before Mr. O'Dwyer, he went himself to value the premises for which the claimant sought to register, accompanied by one of the police valutors of Belfast. The police valuator by whom he was accompanied, was a person who had been selected and paid by both parties, and was a person on whose integrity and trustworthiness it was considered every reliance could be placed.

1948. On looking at these two joint tests of value, the rent and the police valuation, is it your opinion that Mr. O'Dwyer, as a general rule, registered men below the intrinsic value of 10 *l.*?—I do not think he registered any below that value.

1949. Are you aware that there appear on the clerk of the peace's list a number of persons registered by him, whose police valuation is considerably below 8 *l.*—I am.

1950. What explanation can you give in those cases of their appearing upon the registry, having been placed there by Mr. O'Dwyer?—The police valuation is made from the external appearance of the house. In such cases I would say that an 8 *l.* and a 9 *l.* valuation ascertained the house to be worth 10 *l.* if that house be in anything of a good state of repair. But many cases will occur and do occur in Belfast, where, from the external appearance of a dwelling-house, it would not be believed that the house was worth 10 *l.*; but the parties having gardens, and back-houses, offices attached to their dwelling, which back-houses the valutors do not see, in those cases it frequently turns out that the house is of the value of 10 *l.*, but in all such cases Mr. O'Dwyer, according to my recollection, required evidence of the value.

1951. And where that was doubtful, it has been stated here, that he himself made a personal inspection?—He did, accompanied by one of the police valutors.

1952. Mr. O'Connell.] Are you aware that there were several cases, registered by Mr. O'Dwyer, rated as low as 5 *l.*, being the lowest rate in the police valuation?—I am aware that some cases were registered at that valuation, and I have no doubt very properly registered, the parties having premises of the full value; but I say, in all those cases Mr. O'Dwyer required evidence to show that the claimant had value; in other words, he would not preclude the claimant from the franchise, because the police-valuators of the town had made a low estimate of the value of his house, if those parties were able by evidence to show that their house was of a greater value.

1953. In short, he considered it an open question, although the valuation was as low as 5 *l.*, letting in other evidence before himself of the real value?—The question was in every case open to the parties to produce evidence.

1954. Notwithstanding the low valuation in the police books?—Notwithstanding the low valuation in the police books; but in those cases he required that the claimant should prove the value of his house. He put the proof upon the claimant.

1955. Mr. E. Tennent.] Are you quite clear, that in every instance Mr. O'Dwyer placed the *onus* of proof upon the claimant?—Yes.

1956. He did not go upon the principle that the oath was sufficient, unless it was upset by a contrary assertion?—Certainly not.

1957. But the *onus* of proof was distinctly placed upon the claimant?—Yes.

1958. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you apply that answer to every case, or to cases where the valuation was under 10 *l.*?—I am applying it to every case where it became necessary to go into evidence of value; because many cases occurred in which it was unnecessary to prove the value, a rent being paid for the premises of 12 *l.* or 20 *l.* and upwards.

1959. Wherever he was satisfied with the claimant's own case, he did not require more evidence?—Yes; but in order to satisfy him, the claimant must show that he paid 10 *l.* rent, or that he was valued at 8 *l.* in the police book.

1960. Mr. E. Tennent.] You have stated another alternative with regard to leaseholders?—Yes; I have already stated that, or that he should have expended money upon his premises; in which case Mr. O'Dwyer took into account the value of the interest as it appeared before him.

1961. Mr. French.] You say that Mr. O'Dwyer registered several voters who were not rated higher than 5 *l.* in the police valuation. The police valuation is an annual one; are you aware of the police valuation being increased on any of those houses on account of Mr. O'Dwyer's taking the value to be 10 *l.* a year?—I am not aware of its having been increased on that account; but I think it very probable, that

that if the police valuers were in court, and heard that there were back premises, they would avail themselves of that information the next time they went round with their valuation.

1962. *Chairman.*] Are the Committee to understand, that in a case where the police valuation made the house of the value of 8 *l.*, or the rent was 10 *l.*, the *onus probandi* of the disqualification was thrown upon the parties opposing?—Yes; Mr. O'Dwyer considered that the payment of 10 *l.* rent, and a police valuation of 8 *l.*, was a sufficient case to be made out on the part of the claimant.

1963. And then it was for the party that objected to the applicant to disprove the fact of the house being really worth 10 *l.*?—Yes.

1964. Whereas, if those two points did not appear, he then threw the *onus probandi* upon the applicant?—He did.

1965. *Mr. LeFroy.*] Was that principle of decision acquiesced in on both sides, and did it become a standing rule during the rest of that registry?—That principle was acted upon and acquiesced in by all parties during that registry.

1966. And there were no appeals from it?—There were no appeals prosecuted from Mr. O'Dwyer's decisions upon any subject, and of course therefore none in reference to the question of value. I would beg to state that no man could have given more satisfaction in reference to his decisions than Mr. O'Dwyer did on the question of value, and indeed upon every other question. Mr. O'Dwyer came to Belfast a perfect stranger to it; he was certainly unknown to both parties, and his conduct, at a time of great excitement and great contention, when both parties were fighting the registry by every means they could, and when the temper and the judgment of a judge would be very much tried, his conduct met, I believe, the decided and warm approbation of every person who took an interest upon both sides in the politics of Belfast.

1967. *Mr. E. Tement.*] As a proof of that, was not he unanimously selected by both sides as the assessor at two subsequent elections?—He was selected by the returning officer, at the request, as I understood, of the agents for the conservative and the radical interest, to act as the assessor at the election in July 1833.

1968. *Mr. French.*] You are aware that the returning officer has the nomination of the assessor, and it does not necessarily follow that he is appointed by both parties?—I am quite aware of that; I would not have given the last answer merely from the circumstance that Mr. O'Dwyer acted as assessor; I am quite aware that the returning officer has the selection of his own assessor; but it was understood at that time that Sir Stephen May, who was then the returning officer for Belfast, made the selection, either at the request, or certainly with the full approbation of both parties.

1969. *Mr. O'Connell.*] You do not know that of your own knowledge?—I have not stated it of my own knowledge; I have stated it from my understanding at the time.

1970. *Mr. LeFroy.*] Had you an opportunity of knowing that it was the wish of both parties at the time?—It was generally stated by both parties that the selection was made with their consent, or at their request; I believe at their request.

1971. *Mr. E. Tement.*] Are you aware whether those principles were acted upon by the subsequent barristers, Mr. Curry and Mr. Mayne?—They were, and no appeals upon the question of value were at any time prosecuted from the decisions of either of those assistant barristers.

1972. And that during the time when Mr. Curry and Mr. Mayne acted as assistant barristers, equal satisfaction was expressed as during the period of Mr. O'Dwyer officiating?—Yes; the principle of value, as laid down by Mr. O'Dwyer in the way I mentioned, was understood and acted upon by both parties.

1973. Do you mean by "acted upon," that persons did not present themselves who were conscious of not being of the requisite value?—Very few presented themselves who had premises under the requisite value: those who did present themselves were rejected, and did not appeal.

1974. Can you state what change of practice took place upon the appointment of Mr. Fogarty, with regard to the nature of the evidence as to the value?—Yes, at the July registry in 1836, the principle upon which Mr. Fogarty acted was, he took the oath of the claimant as conclusive evidence of value in all cases, whether the rent paid by him was below or above 10 *l.* I will read to the Committee, from the report which I have already stated I prepared of his decisions, cases to illustrate my meaning in answer to this question. The first is the case of Arthur Lavery, "Arthur Lavery, Samuel-street, examined by the barrister, stated that his house

Mr. John Bates.

16 March 1837.

Mr. John Bates.
16 March 1837.

was worth 10 *l.* a-year, and that he had been six months in actual occupation. On cross-examination, he stated that he paid 7 *l.* a-year rent, and 5 *s.* 6 *d.* police tax. Mr. Whiteside then called on the barrister to require further evidence from the claimant as to the value of his house: the barrister said, 'No, I will admit him on his own testimony, unless evidence be produced to contradict him.' Mr. Whiteside contended that the barrister was not bound to credit an incredible thing, and that the circumstance of a person paying but 7 *l.* a-year rent, was of itself *prima facie* evidence that the house was not value for 10 *l.* a-year. The barrister said, 'In every instance in which the party himself swears that the house is worth 10 *l.* a-year, I will admit his vote, unless the contrary be proved.' Mr. Whiteside: 'No matter whether the rent he pays is so low as 2 *l.*' Barrister: 'Yes.' Mr. Whiteside then called on the following witnesses: William Williams being sworn, stated that the claimant's house was not worth 8 *l.* a-year. Hugh Jamieson a valuator, valued claimant's house in last May; it is not worth 8 *l.* a-year. The barrister then said, he would require the claimant to support his case by rebutting the evidence of the last witnesses. The claimant then called John Henry, who stated he could not tell what the house would set for; and on cross-examination, stated he would not take it at all as it stands. The barrister rejected the vote."

1975. Mr. O'Connell.] You said that the barrister took the oath of the man himself as conclusive evidence; you meant *prima facie* evidence till contradicted?—I meant *prima facie* evidence.

1976. You are quite aware that this statement of the case of Arthur Lavery is a mere abstract, and does not give the entire of what the barrister said?—The statement of the case of Arthur Lavery is a full abstract of the facts of the case. I think it right however to state, that according to my recollection, Mr. Fogarty upon that occasion gave one reason for acting upon the principle he did, which was this, that he saw both parties prepared to oppose the claimant, and that he was satisfied they would be prepared with the necessary evidence for that purpose. But with regard to that observation of Mr. Fogarty, I beg to state that it would be utterly impossible to disprove in every case the value of a claimant's house, where he came forward to prove that it was of full value, because you have no power under the Reform Act to summon witnesses to give evidence with regard to a man's house; you have no power to go into a house; and as it was afterwards decided by Mr. Fogarty himself, the architect and builder who might be produced, not being able to state what the value of the house was for the particular business of the claimant, it was impossible to meet this novel line of conduct on the part of the barrister with regard to requiring the parties opposing, instead of the party coming forward with his claim, to give evidence.

1977. Mr. O'Connell.] Why did you omit from your report so material a thing as that declaration of the assistant barrister, that one of his reasons for acting upon this principle, which he was authorised to do under the Reform Act, was, that he saw that state of preparation?—I have already stated to the Committee that if I had extended everything that passed into the report, it would have been impossible to have got it into the newspaper. The observation of the barrister I have at once stated to the Committee, but I have at the same time stated that it would have been impossible to meet that view of the matter, and that subsequently, before Mr. Fogarty, we have found it unavailing to act upon the offer that he himself had made.

1978. But speaking of the accuracy of the report; your notion of its applicability was no reason that you should not give it accurately?—The report states accurately every fact that occurred.

1979. But not the reasons given by the assistant barrister?—It does not give this observation of the barrister, because it formed no ingredient in the facts of the case. It gives the principle upon which he acted.

1980. Is that principle upon which he acted the principle of his decision?—Yes.

1981. Do you remember whether the first person who paid less than 8 *l.* rent was a person brought forward on the conservative interest?—No, my conviction is, indeed I have no doubt of it, that the first case that was brought forward where Mr. Fogarty laid down this doctrine, was the case of Arthur Lavery, which I have just read to the Committee. That applicant was brought forward by the radical party in Belfast. The next case is that of "William Bloomfield of John-street; claimed to register out of a house which he stated to be of the value of 10 *l.* a year; had been six months in possession and paid all his taxes. Cross-examined by Mr. Whiteside. The claimant stated that he paid 8 *l.* 4 *s.* rent, and 6 *s.* 5 *d.* police tax;

tax; that he gave no fine, and that he had occupied the house for two years; that he had often before given notice to register, but never came forward. Mr. Whiteside then submitted to the harrister, that as eight sessions had elapsed since the claimant entered into occupation of his house, and as he had given several notices but had never applied to be registered before, and as the question of value could be decided by joining upon an appeal where the rent and police-tax were so low, it presented a fair case for rejection; and that although the harrister had already thrown out his view upon the question, he submitted that the true construction of the Reform Statute should be, that if the fact of paying 10 *l.* a year rent was to be conclusive evidence in the claimant's favour, he could not conceive why the converse of that proposition should not hold good, that is, that the fact of not paying 10 *l.* a year, but 8 *l.*, without one shilling fine, should make a *prima facie* case against the claimant. The harrister said that when the principle had been before acted upon he would require evidence to contradict the testimony of the claimant, and none being produced he would admit the claimant."

1982. Mr. French.] The harrister admitted the claimant, no evidence being produced upon the other side?—No evidence being produced upon the other side. The next case is that of Michael Lennard: "Michael Lennard, of Michael-street, answered the usual questions to the barrister. On cross examination stated that he paid but 9 *l.* 9 *s.* rent, but would swear it was worth 10 *l.*; that he had paid no fine, was in possession one year and a quarter, that he had served notice, but never before appeared to be registered. In opposition to the claim the following evidence was produced: William Williams, a carpenter and builder, knows the house of claimant; it is in a back street, and not worth 10 *l.* a year. John Brown examined: Knows the house, and has been in several in the same row; it is not worth 10 *l.*, 9 *l.* 9 *s.* being the greatest rent it would bring. Mr. Whiteside submitted that the Reform Statute having fixed the standard of 10 *l.* yearly value, the barrister should admit no claimant who did not come up to that standard, and that when less than 10 *l.* rent was paid, and evidence given to contradict him on the value, that either the claimant should be rejected or evidence called to support his claim. The barrister said that there was a case where the claimant paid 9 *l.* 9 *s.* for rent, and 7 *s.* 6 *d.* police tax, and that where the sum so paid was within a few shillings of 10 *l.* a-year, he was bound to admit the claimant without in the slightest degree discrediting the witnesses who had been produced against the claimant."

1983. Mr. O'Connell.] You are aware that in that year 11 *d.* in the pound was the police tax?—Yes.

1984. That was a case in which the house was valued at 8 *l.* in the police book?—Yes.

1985. That is a fact that you have not stated in your report?—I have not stated in my report that the house was valued at 8 *l.*, but I have stated the police tax, and from that police tax all parties knew the value; the sum at which it was valued was not referred to, but it was the police tax upon that sum, which was as well understood by Mr. Fogarty and the parties present as the police value, and therefore the police tax is as frequently the thing mentioned as the police value.

1986. Mr. O'Connell.] It was known to those who were present, but it was not known to the public in Belfast?—It was the thing spoken of at the registry, of which this is the report.

1987. Mr. Emerson Tennent.] Is not it the usual phrase, in speaking of the police value in Belfast, to name the tax and not the amount of the valuation?—More frequently.

1988. In general, when a person comes up to register, is not the tax the thing that is mentioned, and not the valuation?—It is, because the claimant knows his tax better than the sum at which he is valued.

1989. Consequently that report of yours would enable the public to know what the amount of the police valuation was?—It would; because the tax is the thing that is talked about.

1990. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] Is the poundage the same in one year as in another?—No, it is not.

1991. Is it eleven-pence in the pound every year?—No, it is not.

1992. So that in one year 7 *s.* 6 *d.* may show a valuation of 8 *l.*, and in another year it would not?—Yes.

1993. Therefore putting down 7 *s.* 6 *d.* would not show that the house had been valued at 8 *l.*?—It would show to the public in Belfast, because they paying the tax know full well what the poundage is.

Mr. John Bates.

16 March 1837.

1994. Mr. *Levey*.] Does not the poundage bear always the same relative proportion to the valuation?—In some years those houses which are valued at 20*l.* and under, pay a rate of 1*s.* in the pound; in other years, but very few, they pay elevenpence in the pound.

1995. The tax upon houses of 10*l.* bears the same proportion to the tax upon houses of 20*l.* every year?—Yes.

1996. Mr. *Attorney-General* for Ireland.] But stating the 7*s.* 6*d.* would not enable you to form a notion of the proportion?—No; but it is a thing mentioned by the applicant when he comes up.

1997. *Chairman*.] Is there any class of payers that would not be aware what the value of the house was by being told that such and such was the rate to be levied upon that house?—There is no class of rate-payers that would not be aware of that, because the same principle is each year applied to them all.

1998. So far as that report is concerned, the parties living in Belfast would understand what this house was rated at from their own knowledge of what they themselves paid, so far as the rate-payers were concerned?—Yes.

1999. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Do you recollect how the thing actually occurred; was it the poundage or the valuation that was spoken of at the registry?—It was the poundage that was generally spoken of.

2000. So that that report is correct as regards the way in which the thing actually occurred?—It is.

2001. *Chairman*.] What you are reading is a local publication?—It is the *Guardian*, published in Belfast, dated Tuesday, January 12th, 1836.

2002. Mr. *O'Connell*.] But it circulates out of Belfast?—Yes, it circulates out of Belfast.

2003. The Belfast Commercial *Guardian* circulates in Dublin and elsewhere?—It circulates in the north of Ireland very generally.

2004. Mr. *Attorney-General* for Ireland.] You have stated that Mr. O'Dwyer required two circumstances in addition to the oath; one was, the payment of 10*l.* rent, and the other was a valuation of 8*l.*; but he did consider the valuation of 8*l.* as a circumstance tending to show that the tenement was of the value of 10*l.*—Yes.

2005. And in that case of Michael Lennard there was that circumstance in favour of the claimant?—There was; but there was an absence of the other circumstances of rent.

2006. Mr. *French*.] In the case of Lennard, did the barrister ask for any sustaining evidence?—He did not. The next case which I would state to the Committee to illustrate the principle upon which Mr. Fogarty acted, is that of Joseph Hurlley: "Joseph Hurlley, Michael-street, pays 10*l.* a-year rent; proved to the barrister the usual facts with regard to the value, &c. Mr. Whiteside proposed to prove that this house was not of the value stated by the claimant, and accordingly called John Brown, carpenter and builder, as a witness, who deposed that he knew all the houses adjoining claimant's house; knew claimant's house; it was not worth nine guineas a-year. The barrister said, 'Even believing the last witness, I will register the vote, the difference between the claimant's statement of the value and that of the witness being so trifling.' Mr. Whiteside offered to produce further evidence to prove that all the adjoining houses to the claimant's, and of the same description, were let for 9*l.* a-year. The barrister refused to receive this evidence, and admitted the vote."

2007. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Hurlley paid 10*l.* a-year?—Yes.

2008. And the evidence offered was, that houses near paid but 9*l.* a-year?—So it is stated.

2009. But he did not offer to prove that Hurlley did not pay 10*l.*?—No; but there had been one witness examined in reference to the value.

2010. Mr. *French*.] What was the police-rate of Hurlley?—That does not appear.

2011. Mr. *O'Connell*.] It was not unfavourable, or it would appear?—I am satisfied that if any question had arisen upon the police-rate it would have appeared.

2012. This John Brown, who valued that house at nine guineas, was produced by you on many occasions?—He was.

2013. You paid him for valuing and attending to prove?—Yes.

2014. You paid him by the day?—Yes, paid him for the session.

2015. What did you pay him?—I do not recollect now, but he was paid.

2016. Can

2016. Can you form no estimate?—My recollection is, that he was paid something about six guineas for the sessions; but I would just mention to the Committee, that this very fact which has been alluded to in the question of the Honourable Member, shows how difficult it was for us to meet the proposition put forward by Mr. Fogarty; that is, to disprove the value of houses where claimants came forward to swear to the value of their houses. No man will come forward to oppose his neighbour's getting the franchise in a voluntary way. There is no power of summoning witnesses under the Act, and when persons were employed to value and were paid by us, their evidence is just received with the degree of suspicion that the last question put to me imputes to the evidence of that witness, and it was consequently disregarded, generally speaking.

2017. Mr. French.] What kind of man is Brown; is he an intelligent man?—Brown is an intelligent and respectable builder; he was a man that was a working builder in Belfast, and has bettered his circumstances in life so much that he is now a man of some property in the town, and a man of good character.

2018. Do you believe him fully capable of performing the duty you entrusted to him in valuing houses?—Yes, it was because we considered him capable of doing it, and that his character was fit to bear investigation, and his knowledge fit to bear inquiry, that we selected him.

2019. Mr. Lefroy.] From your experience at those registries, do you conceive that it would be a means of checking the admission of fictitious votes, to have a power of summoning witnesses to the registry?—Certainly.

2020. And that that would be an improvement upon the Reform Act?—It would.

2021. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] Was Brown examined in Lennard's case?—He was.

2022. What did he swear that the house was worth?—He "knows the house, and has been in several in the same row. It is not worth 10 l., 9 l. 9 s. being the greatest rent it would bring."

2023. He must be a very skilful valuator, to swear that it was worth 9 l. 9 s., and not worth 10 l.?—No, I do not think it requires great skill in a man who has been a practical builder, and who has built houses of that description himself, to swear to the value of that house, particularly when it appeared in evidence that the rent the man paid was 9 l. 9 s.

2024. Mr. O'Connell.] It appears that Hurtley paid 10 l. a year rent, and Brown swore that it was worth but 9 l. 9 s.?—Brown swore that it was not worth nine guineas a year.

2025. He did not swear to any particular value there?—No, he did not.

2026. Hurtley's case occurred before Lennard's?—Yes.

2027. Brown swore that the man paid too much rent for his house?—He swore that it was not worth what the claimant had stated to be the rent of it.

2028. Mr. Emerson Tennent.] You have stated the difficulty there is in inducing persons to come voluntarily to give evidence as to the value; do you attribute that to their reception in court generally, and the contempt with which their evidence has been received?—I do believe that where persons find, as in Belfast, that their oath is not considered of as much force or as much value as that of the claimant who is interested in establishing his franchise, they will be unwilling to come forward.

2029. Do not you find that that is a feeling very prevalent amongst respectable men in Belfast, who have come forward to tender their evidence?—I know several who have expressed to me that feeling.

2030. And the consequence is, that parties have been driven to the necessity of having hired valuers, who, appearing professionally, do not seem exposed to that invidious feeling?—Yes, but in addition to that circumstance there is a disinclination which cannot be overcome upon the part of most people, to come forward in opposition to the claim of their neighbour.

2031. Mr. O'Connell.] When did you first begin to employ paid witnesses?—Paid valuers were appointed at the registry in Mr. O'Dwyer's time, in October 1832.

2032. And you continued the practice?—We have continued it down to the last sessions, but we find that evidence now of no value before Mr. Fogarty, and we have, therefore, at the last sessions discontinued the practice. The next case in reference to value that occurs, is that of "Arthur Hamill, Hercules-street; pays eight guineas a year rent; paid 12 l. fine. Mr. Whiteside contended this was a

Mr. John Petre.

16 March 1837.

plain case for rejection, inasmuch as on the claimant's own showing, the house could not be worth 10*l.* a year. The barrister observed that the 10*l.* was not exclusive of taxes, and that the taxes might be included as part of the value, and asked the claimant what taxes he paid. Answer: 7*s.* 4*d.* Barrister: That makes 8*l.* 15*s.* 4*d.*, and 12*l.* fine was paid for the house. I shall register him. It is waste of time to make objections of this kind. Mr. Whiteside submitted that he had never before known that the taxes were to be taken into account, in estimating the value of the house; that he had been before several registering barristers who had never ruled that proposition, and submitted that as the words of the statute were, that the house should be of the clear yearly value of 10*l.*, it was impossible, in estimating the value of the house, to take into account the taxes paid by the claimant. The barrister admitted the vote."

2033. Mr. O'Connell.] The taxes there spoken of represented the police value?—Yes.

2034. It was 8*l.*?—The police tax upon 8*l.* is 7*s.* 6*d.*; 7*s.* 4*d.* appears, both here, in the answer of the witness, and in the tot of the barrister; so that I presume he must have made a mistake as to 2*d.*, in stating his tax, and that the house was valued at 8*l.*

2035. Mr. Emerson Tennent.] But you are clear that 7*s.* 4*d.* was the sum mentioned in court?—I have no doubt of it.

2036. Mr. O'Connell.] But it was manifestly a mistake?—I should think it was a mistake, because there is no such tax as 7*s.* 4*d.*

2037. The man had paid 12*l.* for fine?—Yes.

2038. And he paid 8*l.* 8*s.* a-year rent?—Yes.

2039. And he swore that his house was worth 10*l.* a-year?—Yes, in his opinion.

2040. Chairman.] Did it appear when he paid the fine?—No; my recollection is that it had been paid some time before.

2041. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] Had he a lease?—I think not.

2042. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you think a man pays 12*l.* fine for an 8*l.* house, without getting a lease?—Yes. I have no doubt that such things occur frequently in Belfast.

2043. Holding it as tenant from year to year?—In this case my recollection is that the party had no lease.

2044. A man that has no lease could be put out at six months' notice to quit?—He can; but persons that pay money upon an agreement have little chance in Belfast of being dealt with in that way.

2045. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] He paid 12*l.* consideration for his interest in the premises, being only from year to year, subject to a rent of 8*l.* 8*s.*?—That is my recollection.

2046. Mr. O'Connell.] In point of fact, the man paid eight guineas rent, and in point of fact he paid 7*s.* 6*d.* police tax, in addition to that: that is, he paid 8*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.* annually out of the house?—No; I do not consider the tax at all paid out of the house. I do not consider that the tax is to be added to the rent for the purpose of estimating the value of the house.

2047. Your notion as to valuing the house is one thing; the question now is as to the fact. In point of fact he paid 8*l.* 8*s.* to his landlord, and he paid out of the same house 7*s.* 6*d.* a-year to the police?—In point of fact he paid 7*s.* 6*d.* police tax, in which sum he was assessed as the valuation of that house.

2048. So that in point of fact, for his occupation of that house he paid 8*l.* 15*s.* 6*d.*?—I wish to state distinctly, that I consider the rent as what he pays for the occupation of the house. I consider the tax as what he pays for the paving, lighting, cleansing and watching of the town; and that the value he receives for that tax is not his house, but the cleansing of the town, and his protection in the town. The mode taken to ascertain what he is to pay is valuing his house, and each man pays in proportion to the value of his house: the contribution that each man is to make to the police tax is ascertained upon that principle.

2049. If he is not a householder he pays nothing to the police tax?—If he does not occupy premises in Belfast he pays nothing to the police tax.

2050. He pays nothing if he is a lodger?—No.

2051. It is by reason of being a householder of a dwelling-house that he pays the tax?—All persons that occupy warehouses, and offices, and stores and yards, pay the police tax upon the valuation of those premises.

2052. But

2052. But this was not a warehouse, nor a storehouse, nor a yard, but this was a dwelling-house?—Yes.

2053. Was not it by reason of his occupation of a dwelling-house that he paid the tax?—Yes. His occupying that house was the mode taken to ascertain the amount of tax he was to pay.

2054. Mr. French.] You differ from the barrister; but taking the calculation of the barrister, he makes the rent and taxes amount to 8 *l.* 15 *s.* 6 *d.* Then upon the 12 *l.* fine the least you can allow would be 10 per cent., and that makes up the 10 *l.* valuation according to Mr. O'Dwyer's principle?—The difference between Mr. O'Dwyer's principle and Mr. Fogarty's, in this respect, is this, that Mr. O'Dwyer never added the police tax to the rent the applicant paid; that principle was never acted upon in Belfast till Mr. Fogarty prosed, and he himself added that police tax, without, I believe, any application from the agents for the parties.

2055. Mr. Emerson Tenment.] You have stated that all the barristers required two classes of evidence, the rent in the first place, and the police valuation in the second. In this case one of those classes of evidence was favourable to the claimant, namely, the police valuation; the other was unfavourable, namely, the rent; but by adding the two together, he obtained a second point, favourable to him?—Which brought it near the required standard of value.

2056. So that the two portions of evidence taken separately would not be corroborative, but by adding the one to the other, it made that favourable which was previously unfavourable?—Yes.

2057. Mr. O'Connell.] Instead of two, were not there four ingredients, the rent one?—Yes.

2058. The tax, two?—Yes.

2059. The fine, three?—Yes.

2060. And the oath of the man himself?—Yes; but that ingredient exists in every case.

2061. Mr. Emerson Tenment.] Would not applying generally to all cases this mode of adding the taxes to the rent have a tendency to falsify that which must be *prima facie* the main evidence as to the value of the tenement?—It would have the effect of falsifying, if my view of it is correct, the value of the house.

2062. Chairman.] What is the highest amount of poundage that can be levied under the Police Act upon houses under 20 *l.*?—There is no limit to the amount which may be raised.

2063. If the principle be admitted that the amount of the levy should be added to the rent, so as to make up the whole value of the house, would not a variation in the levy upon those houses cause a great variation in the registered value of those houses from season to season or from year to year?—It would.

2064. Might not the value of houses, therefore, if this mode of valuation were admitted, vary to the amount of one or two pounds from year to year?—Not houses of this class; it might vary it to the extent of a few shillings; but the large houses might be varied to the amount of two or three pounds.

2065. Supposing the levy to be a shilling in the pound, upon 10 *l.* householders; then, if 9 *l.* 10 *s.* be the rent, the 10 *s.* tax would make it 10 *l.*?—Yes.

2066. Supposing the levy to be two shillings in the pound, what would be the effect then; what amount of rent would be necessary then to make up the 10 *l.*?—Then 9 *l.* would make it up.

2067. Supposing it to be three shillings in the pound?—About 8 *l.* 15 *s.* would make it up then.

2068. Would not every additional shilling that was raised for this levy, in point of fact, raise the voting value of the houses?—It would.

2069. And, therefore, of course *pro tanto* lower the qualification?—It would.

2070. Would it not, in point of fact, give to the local authority the power of lowering the qualification in some years and raising it in others?—They could exercise an influence of that kind; but of course it would be controlled in some degree by their expenditure; but they might exceed their expenditure, or they might be lower than the expenditure.

2071. Then a class of houses might be admitted, in fact, in one year, and excluded in another year, according to the rate of local taxation?—Yes; if the rent and the local taxation were taken as the criterion of value.

2072. Then your view of the case is, that the amount of taxation paid has nothing to do as forming part of the real value of the house?—My view is, that it should not be added to the rent of the house as a portion of the value of the house,

Mr. John Bates.

16 March 1837.

and I will state why I think so. By the first Police Act in Belfast, passed in the year 1800, the rate was to be raised off the inhabitants, according to the substance or ability of the person respectively, for the purposes of paving, cleansing, lighting, and so on. The police value was to be assessed according to the substance and ability of the person. Now, it would never be believed that taxing a man added to his substance and ability; that the tax taken from him added to his substance and ability. That criterion of ascertaining the tax has been since departed from, viz, by the Act passed in 1816, the value of the house the man occupies is to be taken as the criterion what he is to contribute to the rates of the town.

2073. You object to the amount of the levy being added to the amount of the rent, and thereby forming a 10*l.* qualification; but you do not object to the amount of levy being assumed as a criterion of the value of the house, subject to certain modifications and to certain evidence?—That is precisely my view of it.

2074. In the Reform Act it is specially required that parties shall have paid the local taxation, with the exception of the last six months. Is there any statement in the Reform Act as to their having paid any rent?—No.

2075. Then there is that distinction made with regard to this qualification in the Reform Act?—Yes.

2076. Mr. O'Connell.] You do not object to the tax being evidence of the value of the house?—I do not object to the police valuation being taken as one of the ingredients in ascertaining the value of the house.

2077. You do not object to the police tax being taken as that ingredient?—I do not object to the police tax being taken as indicative of what the police value it.

2078. If the police increase the amount of the tax improperly, the rent will diminish in the same proportion, for a house rated at 30*s.* a-year will not produce so much rent as another house of the same intrinsic value, rated at only 10*s.* a-year?—I cannot say that any state of things has occurred that would enable me to form any opinion upon this subject. The thing taken into consideration between the landlord and the tenant in making their bargain for the house is the value of the house.

2079. Will not the amount of the rent be diminished in a house of the same intrinsic value, where the rate is higher, as compared with the same kind of house where the rate is lower?—The police rate has never had any influence upon the price at which houses set in Belfast, it is so small with us that it has never had any influence upon the rent.

2080. Do you think that a man would pay 10*l.* a-year for a house with 10*s.* taxation upon it, without recollecting that he was to pay both the 10*l.* and the 10*s.*?—He will recollect that he has to pay both; but he gets the paving, and lighting, and watching of the town, as the value for his 10*s.* of police tax, and his house as the value for his rent.

2081. Are there any cases where the landlords pay the taxes in Belfast?—I have heard of some cases; I believe there are very few indeed; I have heard of one or two landlords who have small houses and who pay the tax.

2082. Did you never know of one?—I have heard of two or three persons, and no more, who do it.

2083. Did you never know it?—No.

2084. Did you never see it proved before you?—I have heard it stated in evidence, in one registry case, that the landlord did pay the tax.

2085. Do not you perceive that the man paid a higher rent by reason of the landlord paying the tax?—Yes, the landlord in that case took upon him to make this payment, which the tenant would be bound to make, and he added it to his rent, and I have no doubt that he added something more in his estimate for paying it. I am quite satisfied that it was a bad bargain for the tenant. I consider that landlords who undertake the payment of rates, will increase the rent more than in proportion.

2086. Will you look at the case of Andrew Godfrey, who "claimed to register out of his house in Charlemont-street; pays 10*l.* a-year, his landlord paying his taxes." That was a case where a man was registered paying 10*l.* a year rent, the landlord paying his taxes?—Yes; "on cross-examination admitted that his premises consisted of but a shop and room, and that his taxes were included in the rent of 10*l.* a year, but stated that he slept in the room. The barrister, after argument, admitted the claimant."

2087. Mr. French.] Was there any evidence produced in that case against the claimant?—No, there was not

2088. Mr

2088. Mr. *Lefroy*.] Could such a thing regularly occur as that two houses of the same intrinsic value should be differently assessed to the police tax?—No.

2089. Then of course that variation in the rent which was supposed by one of the questions which has been put to you resulting from a different valuation could not take place if the houses were of the same intrinsic value?—Not in reference to two houses of the same intrinsic value.

2090. Mr. *French*.] But you were understood to say before, that houses of equal intrinsic value might be differently rated, because you stated that the valuation was made upon the front of the house and there might be back buildings?—There might; but I would state that as an exception from the principle, because when we consider that in the town of Belfast there are about 7,000 houses, the Committee will readily conceive that there will, upon the valuation of those houses, be some errors and some exceptions from the general rule.

2091. Mr. *Attorney-General for Ireland*.] Do you know that in the city of Dublin it is a common subject of complaint that houses are not fairly valued according to their intrinsic worth?—I am not aware, as I do not reside in Dublin.

2092. Mr. *O'Connell*.] With reference to a question that was put to you, if the franchise be affected by an overrate of taxation letting in houses of less value, must not that occur from a false valuation by the valuers?—No. The state of things that I understood the questions put to me to apply to was, the commissioners and the committee of police laying on a high rate upon the valuation made.

2093. What has been the greatest variation in the amount of the rates in Belfast?—Upon houses of 20 *l.* and under there has been no greater variation, according to my recollection, than from one shilling to ten-pence. I think there was as low a valuation as ten-pence, but I am not sure.

2094. Mr. *Attorney-General for Ireland*.] What is the limit in the variation of the tax for the last five years?—I would take one shilling in the pound as the maximum in the case of 20 *l.* houses, and ten-pence as the minimum.

2095. Then the question that was put respecting a great increase of the police tax is a merely imaginary case, which has not arisen in practice, and is not likely to arise in practice?—It has only arisen at present to the extent I have stated, that is, a variation of two-pence in the pound, but as to what extent it may occur to, in an increasing town, I do not know.

2096. Can you state whether the general effect of imposing a tax in respect of a house, is or is not to diminish the rent of the house?—Where the taxes are large, I am quite satisfied that it must diminish the rent that the landlord will get for his house. But in Belfast, where the taxes are exceedingly moderate, and where we know that they are very well applied, I do not think the tax has any influence upon the rent of the house. I know for myself, that in taking any houses that I have from time to time occupied, it has not had any influence upon me, although the tax in some of the cases was large.

2097. Then you conceive that where the tax is considerable, it does diminish the rent?—Where there are such large taxes, for instance, as in Dublin, I would say the rent will be diminished considerably. The sum that a man will get for his house, will be less than he would get for it if he had that house in the same street without taxes chargeable upon it.

2098. Less than if there was no tax in that street?—Yes.

2099. Or no tax in that city?—Yes.

2100. That variation of the rent in consequence of the tax must of course depend upon the amount of the tax, and a very small variation is scarcely perceptible when the tax is very small?—Of course it must be so.

2101. The value of the house is the use of it by the tenant?—The value of the house to the tenant is the enjoyment of the house.

2102. And for that he pays certain considerations?—For that he pays his rent.

2103. For the enjoyment of the house he submits himself to certain liabilities?—He does; he submits himself to the payment of his rent.

2104. Do you consider it as an unfair criterion of the value of the house to the tenant, to ascertain what the tenant subjects himself to for the enjoyment of that house?—I would say that what the tenant subjects himself to for the enjoyment of the house is, the payment of his rent.

2105. Do you consider it an unfair criterion of the value of the house to the tenant, to ascertain what it is that the tenant pays for the enjoyment of the house?—I consider that a fair criterion, with this explanation which I see to arise out of the question: I consider the rent is what he pays for the enjoyment of the house, and

Mr. John Bates.

16 March 1837.

and I consider the tax is what he pays for his enjoyment of the conveniences afforded by the authorities of the town, and that those conveniences and protection are the value he gets for it. In fact, his being an inhabitant of the town, and enjoying its comfort and security, are the value he gets for his tax, although the mode taken to ascertain the contribution which he is to make to the town rates is assessing the value of the house.

2106. It is the occupation of the house by him that subjects him as well to the tax as to the rent?—It is.

2107. Then as a consideration for the occupation of the house by him, he subjects himself both to rent and tax?—He does, with the explanation I have already given with regard to his taxes.

2108. What he gets on one side is the occupation of the house?—What he gets on one side is the occupation of the house, and the enjoyment of the security and conveniences afforded by the police authorities of the town.

2109. He would have that without the occupation of the house; he would have it as a lodger?—He would have that as a lodger, but the Police Act does not get at the lodgers at all.

2110. Therefore it is by the occupation of the house only, that he subjects himself to the tax?—It is by becoming the occupier of the house that he subjects himself to the tax.

2111. Equally with the rent?—Equally with the rent.

2112. And he does both for the sake of the occupation of the house?—He does both primarily for the sake of the occupation of the house.

2113. In order to get the house he voluntarily subjects himself to both rent and tax?—He does.

2114. Mr. *Emerson Tennent*.] Are there any other taxes upon the houses in Belfast; do they pay any contribution to the county grand jury cess?—They do.

2115. Do they pay any other cess or tax?—They pay a small poor-rate, and they also pay a water tax.

2116. If the police tax is to be taken credit for in the valuation of the house, is there any reason why all those other cesses should not also be taken into account?—I cannot see any reason; I cannot see any distinction between them.

2117. Then if that principle be correct, that the police tax is to be taken into account as a part of the value of the house, on the same principle, those other cesses and cesses must also be taken into account?—Yes, I think so.

2118. Can you give any meaning to the word in the Reform Act, "clear yearly value of the house," if all these cesses and taxes are to be included in the value of the house?—I certainly will not take upon me to give a meaning to the word "clear," as expressed in the Reform Act; my belief as to the meaning of the Act, is, that it requires the house itself to be, in the words of Lord Stanley's letter, which I have already read, intrinsically worth 10*l.* a year.

2119. If the legislature did not mean the value clear of these sort of outgoings does it appear to you that there can be any other meaning affixed to the word?—I certainly can affix no other meaning to it.

2120. Mr. *M. O'Connell*.] How do you understand the word "intrinsic;" is you consider the tax placed upon it a part of the intrinsic value of the house?—No.

2121. Is it not a deduction from the intrinsic value of the house?—No, I do not consider it a deduction; I consider the tax a thing paid for a certain accommodation. For instance, the police tax is paid, not for the house, it is paid for the enjoyment that the party who pays the tax has of the lights of the town, and the paving of the town, and the watching of the town. In the same way the water tax is paid, not for the house, but for the water with which the party is supplied; and in the same way the county cess is paid for the enjoyment the party has of the county roads and other accommodations.

2122. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Is not what a man pays for the accommodation of a house, evidence of his own estimate of its value to him?—What a man pays for a house is evidence of what he considers its value to him.

2123. Does he not thereby afford evidence of his judgment of its value?—What he pays for it affords evidence of his judgment of its value to him.

2124. Does not it afford some evidence of its value generally, unless there is some local peculiarity of individual accommodation?—Yes; unless there is some peculiar advantage derived by the person who takes the house, I would consider the rent he pays a fair criterion of the value of the house.

2125. But you do not consider the taxes he pays for it any evidence of his

opinion

opinion of its value?—I do not consider the taxes paid as having anything to do with his views of the value of the house; the rent is the value, as settled upon between him and the landlord, and the taxes are paid upon other grounds. Of course, in stating this, I am not referring to the criterion that the police tax and other public valuations afford relative to what is the value of the house itself.

2126. Mr. M. J. O'Connell.] Supposing that a tenant pays 9*l.* 10*s.* rent for the house, and 10*s.* for the police tax, is not it the same to him whether he does that, or whether he pays 10*l.* gross rent, the landlord paying the police tax?—Yes, it is certainly the same to him.

2127. Is not the intrinsic value of the house to him the same in each case?—Yes; and I would say, that the intrinsic value of the house had been ascertained by the landlord and him to be 9*l.* 10*s.*, and that the 10*s.* is the payment that he ought to make for the keeping the streets of the town in repair and so on, and that the landlord pays it for him.

2128. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] Do you consider that the county rates and the tithe composition diminish the rent?—Yes; a man would get more rent for his land, if it was not for the county rates and the tithe composition.

2129. Do you think the tithe composition and the county rate ultimately fall upon the landlord or upon the tenant?—It depends generally upon the circumstances of the parties; the party who holds under the lease, and has the tithe composition to pay, is the party who suffers.

2130. The question is this: a man has land out of lease subject to tithe composition and county rates, and he is about to demise it; will those taxes fall upon the landlord or upon the tenant?—They will fall upon the landlord.

2131. That is, they will diminish the rent so much?—They will diminish what he receives out of the rent; out of the rent he gets he must pay the tax.

2132. Equally so, whether the outgoing in the shape of tax is directly paid by the hand of the tenant or by the hand of the landlord?—In the case of tithe, the landlord, of course, has to pay it directly himself.

2133. Take the case of county cess?—I consider county cess a different thing, and I would look at it as a different thing from the tithe; the tithe which the landlord has to pay, I would look upon in the same light as the head-rent which a landlord in the town has to pay for his houses, and of course, that head-rent would diminish the profit that he would get: but the county rate I look upon on a different principle. There is no doubt, that if there was no county rate, and if there were good roads without a county rate to keep them in repair, a man would get more for his land without the county rate.

2134. Then the county rate goes to diminish the rent that he receives?—Yes; but while it goes to diminish the rent that he receives, he would get very little rent for his land unless there were roads to the land; so that it is likely that he gets more in the end for the land, in consequence of the existence of the county cess.

2135. Then, in that case, the county rate is the rent which the tenant pays for the increased value of the land?—The county rate is what the tenant pays for the accommodation of the roads.

2136. Thereby importing an increased marketable value to the land?—Increasing the value of the land, no doubt.

2137. So that, in fact, whether it be rent to the landlord or a tax in the shape of county cess, the tenant pays both, and each of them for the value of the land?—The rent I take to be paid for the land, the county rate is paid for the accommodation and use of the roads; if those roads were not in existence he would not pay the rent for the land, and the landlord probably would not get so much.

2138. You have stated, that the tenant pays rent to the landlord for the value of the land, but he pays the county cess for the increased value of the land derived from the objects to which the county cess is applied?—For the accommodation which those roads afford him in the enjoyment of his land.

2139. By "accommodation" is to be understood the increased profit which he may derive from his farm?—Yes.

2140. Then he does get an increased profit from his farm for the county cess?—He is able to work his farm to more profit, because he has the accommodation of roads, for which accommodation he pays the county cess.

2141. Then he pays the county cess for value or for supposed value?—Yes; the roads.

2142. It is the effect which the roads have upon the occupation of his farm, which

Mr. John Bates.

18 March 1857.

which makes the roads of importance to him?—The road would be of no value to him, but as it affords him an opportunity of getting at his land.

2143. And when the tenant subjects himself to both rent and county rates, it is because the land that he gets is, in his estimation, equivalent to the value which he receives from his farm, improved by the roads and other objects effected by the rates?—When a man agrees to pay a particular rent for land burdened with the county rate, he agrees to pay the rent for the land, and the county rate for the road, as affording him the means of working that land.

2144. And the produce of the land must pay for both?—It ought to pay for both.

2145. And of course the tenant expects, generally speaking, that it will pay for both?—He will be enabled by the accommodation of those roads, to work more out of the land, in order to pay the county rate.

2146. Does not he therefore estimate, that the value of the land which he takes is at least equivalent to the amount of the rent and the county charges?—He estimates that the land, with the additional accommodation which the roads give it, is worth the rent and the county rate.

2147. Is there any difference between the word "*accommodation* to a farm arising from roads," and "*value* to a farm arising from roads?"—No, I do not see much difference between them.

2148. Then why are you so particular in making a distinction between the *accommodation* to a farm arising from the roads, and the *value* to a farm arising from roads?—Because I think that by that I express my own meaning more correctly. I confess that, in reference to county business and county rates, my knowledge is very limited, and therefore I wish to be cautious in what I say upon the subject.

2149. When you find an intelligent man aware of his own interest, subjecting himself to rent and county rates for a farm, is it not a fair inference that in that man's judgment, that farm is of the value of the amount, both of the county rates and of the rent?—That the farm, with the means which the roads afford of enjoying the farm, is of that value.

2150. Which you have stated you cannot distinguish from the value of the farm?—I cannot draw a distinction as to the way in which those roads confer a value upon the farm; but I think it is perfectly easily understood by any person. A farm would be of very little value without the roads leading to it.

2151. Facility of market is part of the value of the land?—Yes, the facility of market and the roads leading to the market.

2152. If any person went into any particular district for the purpose of ascertaining the intrinsic value of the land, would he not be justified in inquiring what an intelligent man was willing to pay both in rent and in county charges, for the enjoyment of that land?—In making that inquiry, he might ascertain the most that could be extracted out of the land, but he could not ascertain the marketable price, in my opinion, of the land.

2153. You mean the price that could be got over and above the charges?—I mean the price that will be given beyond what the occupier must pay in the way of rates and cesses.

2154. Mr. Lefroy.] You stated that there are pecuniary taxes or cesses which you have enumerated. Are all those which you have enumerated compulsory, and such as the parties are bound by legal obligation to pay?—Yes, the water tax is compulsory in all those streets of the town into which pipes are laid, which includes the greater part of the town. The county cess is compulsory, and so is the church cess that is raised.

2155. Do you recollect any other tax or cess, besides those you have enumerated?—No, I do not.

2156. Mr. O'Connell.] Are you quite sure that the county cess has nothing to do with the registry?—The county cess must be paid.

2157. But the vestry cess has no connexion with the franchise?—The non-payment of the church cess does not disentitle the party to the franchise, but it certainly is a payment, the amount of which is ascertained by the value of the house that the person occupies, just like the police tax.

2158. Mr. Lefroy.] All the taxes which you have enumerated, are as much charges upon the house as the police tax?—Yes.

2159. You have said that you can see no reason why, if the police tax is to be

taken into account, those should not?—Certainly no reason, and as many more taxes as may be charged hereafter upon the same principle.

2160. If by the alteration of Corporation Reform, the municipal expenses of the town were to be greatly increased, so as to have a very high tax for houses, that also would affect the value of houses?—Yes, provided what a man had to pay was made the criterion of the value.

2161. Mr. Attorney-General for Ireland.] Have you noticed that the fifth section of the Reform Act, which provides the qualification for voting in counties of cities and counties of towns, speaking of the freeholders, states this, that any person "who shall have a beneficial interest therein of the clear yearly value of 10 l. at the least above all rent and charges payable out of the same." You observe those words?—Yes.

2162. In the seventh section do you observe that those words are not annexed to the value therein prescribed. The words are, "shall be *bond fide* of the clear yearly value of 10 l." and the words "above all rent and charges" are left out?—Yes.

2163. The word "charges" is in respect of the freehold tenure, but is not introduced into the seventh section, which relates to occupation without the freehold tenure?—By the fifth section the freehold must be beneficially worth 10 l. over and above all rent and charges. That refers to the freehold.

2164. And by the other section, it is the occupation of a house of the clear yearly value of 10 l., not stating over and above the rent and charges?—Yes.

2165. Will you look at the 10th section, where you find these words: "That no public or parliamentary tax, county, church or parish cess or rate, or any cess or rate upon any townland or division of any parish, barony or half barony shall be deemed a charge payable out of any estate or tenement within the meaning of this Act." Now does not that explain what the word "charge" was intended to mean; that it was not to be a public tax, a county-tax, a church-tax, a parish cess or a rate of any description?—That certainly explains what taxes are not to be within the meaning of the Act.

2166. Therefore it was not necessary, under the 5th section, that the party should have a beneficial interest of 10 l. a year, over and above county charges?—It is not necessary, according to my present view of it, under the 10th section, that in order to have the franchise stated in the 5th section, his interest should be of the value of 10 l. "over and above any public or parliamentary tax, county, church or parish cess or rate upon any townland."

2167. It is not necessary, under the 5th section, that he should have a beneficial interest of 10 l. a year over and above county charges?—So it would appear to me at present; but I have had no experience at all in county registries, and my attention is now called to that section for the first time; but that would appear to me to be the meaning of the passage.

Lanc, 20^o die Martii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Sergeant Ball.
Mr. M. J. O'Connell.
Mr. Moore O'Ferrall.
Mr. French.

Mr. Milnes Gaskell.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Hogg.
Mr. Emerson Tennent.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. John Bates, again called in; and further Examined.

2168. Mr. E. Tennent.] In your examination on the last day, you stated what the practice was which Mr. Fogarty adopted, at the first sessions at which he officiated at Belfast, with regard to the evidence he required for substantiating the value: can you state whether any change has taken place in that practice subsequently?—Mr. Fogarty has changed the principle upon which he acted, to this extent, that in cases where the rent and tax are very low, he now requires the applicant to give evidence, by witnesses swearing to their opinion of the value of his house, in addition to the evidence of the applicant. But, up to the present

Mr. John Bates.

16 March 1837.

Mr. John Bates.

20 March 1837.

Mr. John Bates.
30 March 1837.

time, if the applicant can get witnesses who will swear that, in their opinion, the house of the applicant is worth 10*l.*, Mr. Fogarty will admit him, although the rent should not exceed 8*l.* I will state to the Committee, as illustrating the evidence I have given upon that subject, two cases which occurred at the October sessions in 1836. The first is the case of Francis Campbell.—“ Francis Campbell, Hercules-street, claimed to be registered out of a house in Hercules-street; is in occupation four years; his house is worth 10*l.* yearly to him; pays 6*s.* police tax, and 7*l.* 16*s.* rent; his taxes are paid. Cross-examined by Mr. Whiteside: Is a butcher; has a shop, and kitchen below, and one room up-stairs; it is worth 10*l.* a-year to him; would not leave it for 10*l.*; cannot say what a solvent tenant would give for it; will not swear it worth 10*l.* except to a butcher. Mr. Whiteside having submitted to the Court that the Act required that the qualification should be of the clear yearly value of 10*l.* Mr. Fogarty stated, he would in this case, as the rent and taxes were so low, require evidence to corroborate claimant. Arthur Rice was examined in support of claim: Knows Campbell's house; does not know the annual value, but would give 10*l.* a-year for it as a butcher; will not swear it worth 10*l.* to a solvent tenant. Cross-examined: Lives in same street; is a butcher himself; pays 14*l.* for his own house; it is a good street for business; was not up-stairs in Campbell's; there is no increase of value in that street for some time past. William Campbell, examined in opposition to the applicant: Lives in Hercules-street; is a butcher; knows Campbell's house; will not swear it value or not value for 10*l.*; if a person wanted a house and could get no other, he might give 10*l.*; does not wish to give any opinion on the subject. William Smith examined: Is an architect; examined Campbell's house on two occasions; it is not worth 10*l.*; it is a very small house; shop and kitchen with very small yard; one room up stairs; found it difficult to get up staircase, being so narrow; the house altogether is in miserable repair. Mr. Whiteside stated that this was a case which ought to be rejected. An effort was making to drag the value of houses considerably under the amount required at the legal standard, which he trusted the decision in this case would put a stop to. No one but a person in a fit state for bellam could suppose that houses of such low rent as that from which the present claimant sought to register, were in the words of the Act, ‘*bono fide*’ of the clear yearly value of 10*l.*, particularly in Belfast, where the competition for houses was such as to enable the landlord to obtain the full value for them. Nor could it be believed that a landlord having a house fifty worth 10*l.* would set it for 7*l.* 16*s.* On the contrary, he would set it for the best rent he could get. This house was four years in the applicant's possession, and it was proved that it had not increased in value since. He would also beg to impress on his worship the important fact, that the applicant had been rejected by himself in July last for want of value. He therefore considered it a fit case for rejection, and the applicant might appeal and bring the matter before a jury, the most fair way of deciding it. The barrister here said, that he could not believe that Mr. Whiteside intended this language for him, and that the applicant, in addition to the rent he paid for the house, had a right to take into consideration the peculiar advantages of his house, from its situation for business. He thought the weight of evidence in favour of the applicant, and would register him.”

2169. It appears that that case was rejected by the barrister at the previous sessions?—It was rejected by Mr. Fogarty for want of value in July 1836.

2170. Are you aware whether any alteration had taken place in the premises?—I believe not; the applicant did not, upon his application in October 1836, state that any improvement had taken place, and I am quite satisfied that no improvements have taken place.

2171. So well as you remember, was any additional evidence given upon the second application beyond what there was upon the first?—Upon the second application the two persons whose evidence I have read were produced to swear to their opinion as to the value of the house to a butcher, but there was no other additional evidence.

2172. Mr. French.] Did not Mr. Fogarty reject the applicant the time before for want of corroborating evidence?—He rejected him before for want of value.

2173. Did not he state that it was a case in which he found it necessary to call for corroborating evidence, and asked for it?—No doubt his rejection of him for want of value was because he did not produce witnesses to prove the value.

2174. That man again applied to be registered, and did bring forward witnesses to prove the value?—He brought the two witnesses whose evidence I have read.

2175. There

2175. There came forward two witnesses, one of whom swore that he would give 10*l.* for the house, and the first witness produced in opposition swore that he would not state it to be under the value?—The witness produced in opposition would not take upon him to give any evidence about it, arising, as it appears, from a disinclination to give any evidence where their neighbours' houses were concerned.

2176. Do not you think another view might be taken of it, namely, that he could not conscientiously swear to its being under the value?—The man was evidently reluctant to give any evidence at all upon the case.

2177. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Do you know who the landlord of that house is?—*Mr. John Black* is the landlord.

2178. And the rent paid was 7*l.* 16*s.*?—Yes.

2179. And continues to be so?—Yes; and, I believe, paid either by weekly or monthly payments. The next case is that of *Owen M'Cann*: "*Owen M'Cann* claimed to register out of a shop in Crown-entry. Is three years in possession; pays 8*l.* 8*s.* rent and 5*s.* police taxes; laid out some money improving the shop, and swears it worth 10*l.* yearly. Cross-examined by *Mr. Whiteside*: Laid out 11*l.* on the shop for repairs, including tables, forms, and matting; it is an oyster shop; the shop is worth 10*l.* a year to him as an oyster-man; cannot say if a solvent tenant would give 10*l.* for it. *James Meenan*: Knows the shop occupied by *Owen M'Cann*; he sells oysters there; thinks it worth 10*l.* a year to him, or any other oyster-man. *Pat. M'Loughlan*: Knows *M'Cann's* house; he has improved it since he took it; thinks it would set for 10*l.* to a man in the oyster trade; there were necessaries nearly opposite, which made it very unpleasant; the entry is narrow at this place; it is about twelve months since witness was in the shop, which was before the improvements. Two witnesses were examined against the applicant, one of whom stated the shop not worth 6*l.*, situated in the narrow and filthy part of the entry, with privies quite convenient to it; these privies were considered public nuisances, and the police authorities were obliged to interfere and have them closed up. *Mr. Gilmer*, clerk to the police committee, examined: The police were obliged to order the necessaries in Crown-entry to be filled up a very short time since. Applicant admitted."

2180. *Mr. French.*] You stated that it was only on the shop that he claimed to register. Was there not the house that he resided in as well as the shop?—I think the party does not reside upon the premises, but the list of the clerk of the peace will at once show whether it was out of a house or a shop. The premises out of which the man claimed to register was a shop and a kind of loft above the shop; between that and the shop, as I recollect, there was no internal communication.

2181. *Chairman* (to *Mr. Darcus*.) What is *Owen M'Cann* registered for?—A shop.

2182. *Mr. French* (to *Mr. Bates*.) Are you aware whether the witnesses who were examined in corroboration of the statement of the claimant, were persons residing in the neighbourhood, who might be supposed to have local knowledge of the value of the premises?—I am not aware whether — was a person residing in the neighbourhood, but *M'Loughlan* had resided in that neighbourhood and had left it. It appears from his evidence that he had not been in for a year previously.

2183. The privies which are mentioned as being one objection to the house, it was stated in the evidence afterwards, had been stopped up?—Yes.

2184. *Mr. M. J. O'Connell.*] That rather improved the value of the premises?—Yes, the premises would bring more from the circumstance of stopping up the privies that had been opposite to them.

2185. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Are you aware in recent time, of *Mr. Fogarty's* admitting without corroboration, any applicant who is not of the value of 10*l.*?—Yes; in the case of *Michael Kavanagh*, in January 1837.—"*Michael Kavanagh*, Barrack-street, cowkeeper, applied to register out of house and land in that street; he told *Mr. Nelson* it was worth 10*l.* a-year. Cross-examined by *Mr. Whiteside*: He pays '9*l.* odds' rent; he is always improving his premises; he has built a cow-shed and has left the door where it was. That is an improvement. He has improved the wall round the place, he has not built it a bit higher, it stands in the same place, and that is another of his improvements. Claim admitted."

2186. *Mr. French.*] What was the police valuation?—The police valuation does not appear in the evidence.

Mr. John Bates.

20 March 1897.

2187. Was there any corroborating evidence called?—No; there was no corroborating evidence required in the case.

2188. *Mr. Hogg.*] How long had that man been in occupation of the premises?—He had been in occupation in the year 1832. I find him in the police-book for the year 1832, and of course from that to the year 1836. He may have occupied previous to 1832.

2189. Was there any evidence produced against the value?—No. The cases I mentioned are to explain what I stated with regard to Mr. Fogarty's principle, namely, that he admitted persons who paid less than 10 *l.* rent without corroborating evidence.

2190. But they might prove all that, and there might be evidence called to disprove the value?—Certainly; but I conceive, that where a party comes forward to claim the franchise, it lies upon him to prove that claim by fair and reasonable evidence.

2191. *Mr. Hamilton.*] The first two cases you quoted to-day you quoted with the view of showing that Mr. Fogarty proceeded upon the principle that the franchise was to be determined, not by the intrinsic value, but by the value to a particular person?—Mr. Fogarty's principle, as I deduce it from his observations and his decisions, is, that the value of the tenement is to be taken by what it is worth to the tenant for the particular business in which he is.

2192. Was it with that view that you quoted those two cases?—The view with which I quoted those two cases was to show the change in Mr. Fogarty's principle in this respect; that at the first session he took the oath of the applicant, without regard to the lowness of the rent, to establish the case of the applicant; but that subsequently he required the applicant, where the rent was very low, to produce evidence to support his value; but that if the applicant did produce evidence to the extent of matter of opinion, he would admit him, though the rent and tax should not exceed 8 *l.*

2193. *Mr. French.*] According to the view taken by Mr. Fogarty, he was not content with proof that it was of the value of 10 *l.* to the applicant, but he demanded evidence to prove that to other persons in the same line of business the house was of the value of 10 *l.*?—Yes; he required him to prove by the evidence of witnesses that in their opinion it would bring 10 *l.* to another person in the same business. What we conceived was this, that the landlord took the peculiar advantage of the place of the business into his consideration when he was letting his house, and that allowing the tenant to add the peculiar advantages of it to his rent was in fact taking credit for the peculiar advantages of the house twice.

2194. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] How far, in your opinion, does that correspond with the intentions of the Reform Act, as stated in the letter of Lord Stanley, who introduced the Reform Bill?—The intention of the Reform Bill, as stated in Lord Stanley's letter, in reference to the question of value, is, that it should be intrinsically worth that sum, not for any particular business, but that it would bring that sum in the market.

2195. *Mr. M. J. O'Connell.*] Do you consider Lord Stanley's interpretation of the Reform Act binding?—It is not legally binding, but it is explanatory of the intentions of the government of that day by whom it was brought in.

2196. *Mr. French.*] Is not that street where Campbell's house is, a great locality for butchers?—It is one of the butcher-markets in Belfast.

2197. Do not you consider that a house of a certain size for a butcher would be of more value if situated in Hercules-street, than it would be in another part of Belfast?—Certainly; but I have no doubt that Mr. John Black, the landlord of that house, took the peculiar advantages of that house into his consideration when settling the rent; and I am satisfied that this house of Campbell's, for which Mr. Black gets a rent of 7 *l.* 16 *s.*, if it was in another part of the town would not set for 5 *l.*

2198. Are you aware that several butchers have been registered out of stalls in Belfast?—Yes, but those parties pay a higher rent than this; their rent comes to either 10 *l.* or 14 *l.*

2199. You are also aware that those stalls would for any other persons than butchers be worth nothing like the money?—Certainly, the stalls in Montgomery's market might be valuable for other businesses, because there are dealers of several descriptions in that market; but certainly to butchers they are worth what they pay for them.

2200. *Mr. Hogg.*] It was the vicinity of the butchers which gave the house its value.

value, but that vicinity was devoted to the same occupation at the time of the taking?—It was.

2201. Mr. Emerson Tenant.] Therefore the marketable value of the house, including the advantages of the locality, was in your opinion the rent paid for it?—I have no doubt the landlord and tenant, in making their bargain for the house, took both circumstances into consideration, because I have stated already, that that house of Campbell's, which I believe is a very miserable place, would not bring 5*l.* in another part of the town.

2202. Mr. French.] You say those shops had been devoted to butchers at the time of the original taking; now are you aware when the original taking was?—Hercules-street has been devoted to butchers' shops and a butchers' market ever since I have had any knowledge of it, which is 12 years ago.

2203. It is from your general knowledge you speak?—It is from my general knowledge. I can state how long, according to the police books, this man Campbell appears to have been in that house. He appears rated in the police books of 1834, and occupied it therefore 1834, 1835, and 1836.

2204. Mr. Emerson Tenant.] Do you know what it is rated at?—Six pounds in the police valuation.

2205. Mr. Hamilton.] It appears from your answer, that you do consider that the advantages of the locality are legitimately, to a certain extent, one of the elements of the intrinsic value?—Yes, I do consider that the advantage of the locality should be taken into consideration in estimating the value of a house in the market; but I conceive that that is taken into account by the landlord and the tenant when they are ascertaining the rent, and that allowing the applicant to take credit for those peculiar advantages when he comes up to register, in addition to the rent, is in fact taking credit for those peculiar advantages for business twice over, in making up the value of his house.

2206. You also consider that the measure of the value, including the advantages of locality, is what may be called marketableness?—Yes.

2207. Mr. Emerson Tenant.] Are you aware of any cases in which a doubt has arisen as to the value of houses, and Mr. Fogarty has been pressed to reject the claimant in order that that value might be tried by a jury, and he has consented to do so?—No; there were cases which occurred, that of Bloomfield, who was registered in January 1836, and of Campbell, who was registered in 1837, both of which I have stated to the Committee, in which it was sought to have a rejection on the question of value against those parties, in order that they might take the opinion of a jury as to the value of the houses, and in both those cases Mr. Fogarty refused to reject for the purpose of taking the opinion of a jury upon it.

2208. Mr. French.] Are you aware that the parties are entitled to the benefit of the opinion of the assistant barrister, whatever it is?—Certainly.

2209. Are you aware that an appeal is an expensive process?—No, it is not expensive. Those appeals, as far as regards the individuals themselves, I believe are very little expense to them. It is their parties who meet those expenses.

2210. Is not the person obliged to go to expenses?—He certainly is obliged to go to expenses, but he can be heard as to the value of his house without counsel.

2211. He is obliged to bring witnesses?—Certainly.

2212. And to employ counsel?—He is not obliged to employ counsel.

2213. In order to put his case advantageously, will he not, in all probability, employ counsel?—The general habit is to employ counsel, but it is not indispensable.

2214. Mr. E. Tenant.] If expense would be entailed in the event of a rejection, are you aware, on the other hand, of Mr. Fogarty ever having referred parties to this House, in order to take improper persons off the registry by a Committee here, who have been admitted?—Yes, when the conservative party complained of the hardship of acting upon the principles that were objected to in Mr. Fogarty's decisions, they requested a rejection to try whether those principles were sound in point of law, and Mr. Fogarty stated that we could have redress by an election petition to the House of Commons.

2215. And that would be as expensive a process as an appeal to the sessions?—Certainly, much more expensive; so expensive, that with a large constituency the party will frequently rather lose the election than go to the expense of prosecuting the petition.

2216. Therefore the mere consideration of expense does not appear to have influenced Mr. Fogarty either in admitting or rejecting?—No.

Mr. John Bates.

20 March 1837.

2217. Mr. French.] The case you allude to was upon the lodger point?—I recollect Mr. Fogarty making that remark upon two or three occasions.

2218. In either of those cases, did Mr. Fogarty appear to have any doubt upon his mind as to the correctness of his decisions?—He did not appear to have any doubt as to the correctness of his decisions.

2219. There is one case which you have not mentioned; the case of Leeson, in Talbot-street. Leeson paid 9 *l.* rent; the police valuation was but 6 *l.*, and he swore that it was worth 10 *l.* a-year. In that case Mr. Fogarty did not call for any evidence to corroborate the statement of the applicant, but there was evidence of a Scotch architect produced against it, who swore that he did not consider it to be of the value, and declared it to be only of 6 *l.* value. Mr. Fogarty then called for evidence, and a neighbour of the man came forward and proved it to be of the value, and Mr. Fogarty admitted him. Do you recollect that case?—I do; I will read the report of the case to the Committee. "John Leeson, Talbot-street, shoemaker, was objected to by Mr. Nelson. He pays 9 *l.* rent and 6 *s.* taxes. It was worth 10 *l.* a-year. Mr. Nelson said they would produce a witness to show it was not value. A Scotch architect, whose name our reporter did not hear, was produced and sworn. He said the house was not worth more than 6 *l.* a-year. Cross-examined by Mr. Whiteside: Is an arbitrator and valuator. Visited this house as persons on the other (conservative) side visited others; he went to this house last night and this morning; dis-remembers what time he went there last night; he did not get in; was in the hall this morning, went up stairs. On his oath it is not worth 6 *l.* a-year; cannot say whether he or the tenant, or the landlord, is the best judge of this; there may be some houses out of which a vote has been registered in Belfast; there is a yard to it four feet square; he heard an individual say the rent was 8 *l.*; he does not know whether this was in Leeson's house or in some of the other houses; he did not make a note of this when he heard it (witness had a large memorandum-book in his hand); does not know where he heard it or from whom; often valued houses, but cannot tell any now that he did value; never valued any houses in this way before; has often valued places, cannot say what places; he has looked at many houses. Mr. Whiteside remarked upon the absurdity of this man's valuation; the landlord asked 9 *l.*, the tenant paid it. The police valuator, impartial judges! fixed its taxes at 6 *s.*; they always fixed the taxable value something below the real value, and yet this man came forward to swear it was not worth 6 *l.* Not because it was necessary, but merely to show how far such testimony was to be relied on, he would produce a witness. Mr. Downes was called and sworn; examined by Mr. Whiteside. He lives next door to the claimant, and pays 10 *l.* rent and 7 *s.* taxes; considers claimant's house better than his own; the garret of claimant's house has a patent sky-light in it; witness would give claimant 10 *l.* for the house, he would give it that moment if he would take it. The writer said he did not see how it was possible that the valuator had valued one of these houses which were both together at 6 *s.*, and the other, a worse house, at 7 *s.* Mr. Whiteside said they were guided merely by the outward appearance; like 'the architect' who had been examined, they did not see the garret, which, in fact, added another floor to Leeson's house because of the sky-light. Claimant admitted."

2220. From the evidence of the Scotch architect, it may be supposed that this Leeson was a conservative?—He was.

2221. Mr. Fogarty acted there upon the principle of preferring the evidence of a neighbour, who knew the locality, to that of an architect?—He did; but I would certainly say, that from the circumstance of the claimant paying 9 *l.* rent, and the police value, which was upon all hands confessed to be moderate, being six pounds, the swearing of that architect was of no value in the matter; that he proved too much to be credited, in proving that that house was only worth 6 *l.* That architect, to whom I refer, is a person of the name of Kent.

2222. Mr. Fogarty appears to have acted upon the principle that he laid down equally for both sides, in taking the evidence of a neighbour, who knew the locality, in preference to that of an architect?—Yes; there is another case here of the same class with that I have just been mentioning, where Mr. Fogarty admitted, without corroboration, a person who paid below 10 *l.*, and that is "Patrick M'Guire, porter, Union-street; admitted on his cross-examination, by Mr. Whiteside, that he pays 9 *l.* rent, and that his rent had been twice reduced, yet his house would let for 10 *l.* Admitted."

2223. Mr. French.] Are you aware whether Patrick M'Guire did not at one time pay 12 *l.* rent?—It appeared from the evidence, that his rent had been reduced

deduced from a higher sum to 9 *l.* I do not know what the precise rent he had previously paid was; but I should suppose he had previously paid, at all events, 10 *l.*, and possibly more.

2224. Mr. *Emerson Tenant.*] And it was reduced, probably, upon a representation that it was not worth 10 *l.*?—I think there is fair reason to conclude that the landlord would not reduce it, except upon an application from the tenant, grounded upon the house not being worth the rent he paid for it.

2225. Mr. *French.*] What was the police valuation?—It was 7 *l.* in the previous year, and it appears to have been 8 *l.* in 1834 and 1835.

2226. So that while the man was getting a reduction of his rent, the police valuation was increasing?—It was increased by 1 *l.*

2227. You were asked whether the landlord did not reduce the rent upon the application of the tenant. Supposing that he held it above the value, do not you think it possible that the landlord might have given it to the tenant something below the real value, considering that he had for some time received a sum beyond the value?—It is certainly possible. It is possible that the landlord would give it at less, rather than that the tenant should leave; but I would have very little faith in a landlord becoming contrite for having charged a man too high a rent, and charging him a very moderate one for the future.

2228. If a man had been receiving 12 *l.* a year where it ought to have been 10 *l.*, he might in consideration of that let him have it for 9 *l.*?—I do not think such cases occur.

2229. Do not you think that the landlord regarding his own interest might make this reduction, finding that he had an improving tenant to deal with, because as the police rate was increasing, the tenant was probably improving the house?—The landlord may have made a reduction rather than lose a good tenant, or upon the promise of the tenant to improve the house; but, *primò facie*, I would say that the circumstance of a landlord reducing his rent, is evidence that the place is not worth what he had been previously getting.

2230. Mr. *M. J. O'Connell.*] Does not the increase in the police valuation afford reasonable ground of presumption, that it was not in consequence of a decrease in the value of the house that the rent had been lowered?—It affords ground for presuming that the house was not getting worse, but it does not rebut the supposition that the landlord, in getting either 10 *l.* or 11 *l.*, might have been getting too much.

2231. Mr. *French.*] The police valuation generally bears some proportion to the rent, and it has been the custom to estimate the rent as one ingredient in the qualification, and the police valuation as another. Now here is the case of George Pinkerton, at 14 *l.* rent and 6 *s.* police tax, how should you explain that?—I observe on looking to George Pinkerton's police valuation, that he stood valued at No. 34, Prince's-street, at 5 *l.* from the year 1832 down to the year 1836, both years inclusive; I have certainly great doubts whether that claimant paid 14 *l.* a year for his house; I do not know whether he stated it so or not; it certainly appears in the report.

2232. Mr. *Emerson Tenant.*]—Do you know the individual?—No, I do not.

2233. Are you aware that there is a man of this name who has kept the Carman's Inn, in Prince's-street, with a large yard attached to his premises?—No, I do not know George Pinkerton at all.

2234. Mr. *O'Connell.*] Do you recollect Mr. Fogarty's saying upon that occasion, that the disproportion between the rent and the police valuation shook his faith in the police valuation from that time?—No, I do not remember the circumstances of this case of Pinkerton; I observe what the police valuation is in reference to it, and I observe that in the report it is stated that the rent was 14 *l.*, but I apprehend that must have included more premises than that he was valued for; but however I do not recollect the circumstances of the case sufficiently to state them.

2235. Do you think, that if there were any such remarkable circumstances in the case, the reporter of the *Ulster Times* would have passed them over as he does, when the reports of the other cases are so full?—I think, if any peculiar circumstances had occurred, they would have been stated; but I think the premises for which he paid the 14 *l.*, if he did pay 14 *l.* rent, must have been more than what was included in the 5 *l.* valuation, but I do not recollect the circumstances of the case.

2236. Mr. *Emerson Tenant.*] Are you aware of any cases valued in the police books at 8 *l.* which have been rejected by previous barristers?—Yes; there are many cases valued in the police books at 8 *l.* which have been rejected by the former barristers, by Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry, and Mr. Mynne.

2237. Do you recollect any instances in which Mr. Fogarty has rejected a person who

Mr. John Bates.

40 March 1837.

who was valued at 8*l.* in the police book?—No; there is no person rejected whose premises were valued as high as 8*l.* in the police book.

2238. Looking at the principles of evidence acted upon by Mr. Fogarty, and his practice as assistant barrister, and the class of persons who have been generally admitted since his appointment at Belfast, do you consider that the 10*l.* qualification actually exists at Belfast at this moment?—I have no hesitation in stating, that I am of opinion that the qualification at Belfast, to entitle the party to a franchise, is reduced below the 10*l.* qualification, and that, therefore, the 10*l.* franchise, as a criterion of value, does not exist in Belfast; that is, taking the standard of value to be what the house of the applicant will fairly bring in the market.

2239. Can you give the Committee any idea of what number of persons you conceive may have been admitted by Mr. Fogarty, whose houses are under 10*l.* value?—Since I was summoned to give evidence before this Committee, I had a list made out of all the persons registered by Mr. Fogarty whose police valuation was below 9*l.* in the police books, and I handed them to the police valuers of the town, the four sworn valuers, with a request, as I understood that they were also summoned, that they would examine those houses, so as to be prepared to state to the Committee whether they were or were not worth 10*l.* a year; and if they were of opinion that any of them were not worth 10*l.* a year, to be prepared to state those cases to the Committee. I made that list out, without any reference to either the conservative party or the radical party; and these valuers will state to the Committee the result of their examination into the value of those houses.

2240. As a matter of your own belief and opinion, so far as you have ascertained by personal examination, and from your general knowledge of the town, and likewise from your constant attendance at the registries, can you give any idea to the Committee what number of persons may have been registered by Mr. Fogarty below the 10*l.* qualification?—I cannot state the number of such registries: several persons have been registered whose houses were not worth 10*l.*; but I can state to the Committee, that it appears by the clerk of the peace's list that ten persons have been registered by Mr. Fogarty who were rejected for want of value by his predecessors. I have prepared a list of those persons, in order that all parties may have the benefit of seeing who they are; and I have also added the police valuation at which they were rated at the period of their rejection by the former barristers, and the police valuation at the time they were admitted by Mr. Fogarty. I may state, in reference to the list that I have just referred to, that some of those persons were rejected more than once for want of value. It also appears from the police books and other documents, upon which I can rely, that six persons have been registered by Mr. Fogarty out of houses, the former occupiers of which were rejected for want of value. I have also, in this case, given the police value at which the former occupiers were rated, and the police value at which the parties were rated at the time of their registry; this list I will hand in.

[The same was delivered in and read, as follows:]

ELECTORS REGISTERED since the 6th of January 1836, who were formerly Rejected for want of Value.

When Registered.	Name.	Street.	Police Value.	When Rejected.	Police Value.	—
1836.						
January	James Kearney	Bollymacarrett	£.	Oct. 1832	£. 5.	
—	Peter Martin	Henrietta-street	8	Apr. 1833	7	
April	James Devlin	Mary-street	8	Oct. 1832	8	
—	Alexander McKeeffe	Comme-street	8	Oct. 1832	5 5	- valued, 1834, at 7 <i>l.</i>
				and		
July	Joseph Magee	Michael-street	8	Apr. 1835	6	
October	James Hamilton	Wine Tavern-st.	6	Apr. 1835	6	
—	John Mulholland	Grafton-street	8	Oct. 1832	6	- valued at 6 <i>l.</i>
—	Bernard McEveena	James-street	8	Oct. 1832	8	from 1832 till 1837.
				Jan. 1834	8	
				Apr. 1834	8	
				Apr. 1835	8	
—	John Robb	Gordon-street	6	Oct. 1832	6	- viewed by
1837.						Mr. O'Dwyer.
January	Francis Donoghy	Millfield	8	Oct. 1832	6	Police value, 6 <i>l.</i> , from 1832 till 1837.

ELECTORS REGISTERED since January 1836, out of Houses, the former Occupiers of which were Rejected for want of Value.

Mr. John Bates.

20 March 1837.

Registered.	Name.	Street.	Police Value.	Applicant Rejected.	When.	Police Value.
1836.			£.			£. s.
April	James Giffin	Edward-street	6	Park Maguire	Oct. 1834	0 -
July	John M'Mullen	Hercules-street	6	Andr. Stewart	Oct. 1832	6 -
Oct.	Bernard Donaghy	Barrack-street	8	Saml. Thomson	Oct. 1832	5 8
—	William Fearose	Lodge-lane	7	Geo. Hadzick	Jan. 1835	7 -
—	Arthur Rice	Hercules-street	8	John M'Alvey	Apr. 1835 and Oct. 1832	7 - 5 -
1837.						
Jan.	Edward Woods	Millfield	8	Nichs. Magh	Oct. 1832	8 -

Mr. Bates.] On looking over the persons registered by Mr. Fogarty, since and including January 1836, I observe that 70 persons have been registered by him whose police tax varied from 8*l.* to 5*l.*, and who have been occupying their present houses from five to three years, but who never before applied to be registered. This list does not include any of those who were rejected for want of value, or who had at all appeared before the former harristers to claim the franchise; I have prepared a list of those persons, with their police tax in each year, from and including the year 1832, or the year in which they appear first rated, in order that it may be seen in what cases the tax was raised, so as to raise a presumption that the value was increased, and in order, on the other hand, to show cases in which the police tax was lowered instead of increased.

2241. Are you prepared to state the result of this abstract to the Committee?—The result of the list of applicants that I hold in my hand, who have been occupying their houses from five to three years, and who are valued at and below 8*l.* in the police books, appears to be 70 persons admitted by Mr. Fogarty, who had been occupying their houses, all of them from three to five years, who never before applied to obtain the franchise.

2242. Are you aware of any persons being admitted by Mr. Fogarty, who have been three times rejected by his predecessors, without having ever appealed?—Yes, Bernard M'Wiany was rejected on four occasions for want of value; did not appeal from the rejection; he was rejected in October 1833, January 1834, April 1834, and April 1835, and his police value at all those periods of rejection was 8*l.*, and that was also the amount of his police valuation at the time he was admitted.

2243. Mr. French.] Is this case reported?—No, it is not.

2244. Mr. Emerson Tenent.] Who was the barrister when he was first rejected in 1833?—Mr. Curry.

2245. So that he was rejected both by Mr. Curry and Mr. Mayne?—Yes.

2246. Mr. M. J. O'Connell.] When was he registered?—In October 1836.

2247. Mr. French.] As this case is not reported, it does not appear whether the evidence is the same?—No.

2248. You cannot take upon yourself to state that Mr. Fogarty admitted it upon the evidence upon which it was originally rejected?—I cannot, but I presume that upon four hearings of the case the party would have produced as much evidence as he could.

2249. The only evidence that you bring forward is the same at each time, the police valuation, which was favourable according to the doctrine laid down by Mr. O'Dwyer and by Mr. Fogarty himself?—The police valuation, as far as it goes, would be favourable to the claim, but the police valuation appears to be the same at all those times.

2250. Was there any rebutting evidence produced against the claim?—No.

2251. Mr. M. J. O'Connell.] Can you at all account for the circumstance of the Ulster Times having passed over the case, under the circumstances you have mentioned?—I cannot account for why the person, who reported for the Ulster Times in October 1836, did not report the case.

2252. Mr. French.] The Ulster Times is not very favourable to Mr. Fogarty?—The politics of the Ulster Times and Mr. Fogarty's certainly do not agree.

Mr. John Bates.

20 March 1837.

2253. Do not the Ulster Times take every opportunity of attacking Mr. Fogarty's decisions?—I cannot say that they have taken every opportunity, but I believe they have alluded to his opinions, and criticised them upon many occasions.

2254. You will not deny that there has been a little party acrimony in them?—I have no doubt that it is impossible to carry on those things in a newspaper without a good deal of party acrimony; but I have no hesitation in saying, that if I was connected with the public press, and entertaining the opinions I do as to Mr. Fogarty's decisions, I would certainly have canvassed those opinions and argued against them just as powerfully as I could.

2255. If you were so connected with the public press, finding that you had so good an opportunity as the circumstance of Mr. Fogarty having registered a man who had been rejected four times by other barristers, if the circumstances of that rejection had been in your favour, would not you have thought it necessary to bring them before the public?—Yes, if I was managing a public paper, and a reporter brought me such a case, I would insert it.

2256. You have stated that the 10*l.* franchise does not at present exist in Belfast, that is, according to the standard laid down by Mr. O'Dwyer?—According to the system of dealing established between landlord and tenant as the criterion of value, and according to what I conceive to be the marketable value of houses in Belfast.

2257. You know the standard laid down by Mr. Fogarty. Has Mr. Fogarty admitted persons not qualified according to that standard?—As to the standard laid down by Mr. Fogarty, as I have already stated, his decisions in June 1836 varied in some degree from his subsequent decisions; but as far as I can collect his standard it is this, that if the applicant will swear as matter of opinion, that his house is worth 10*l.*, notwithstanding that matter of opinion is rebutted by the fact that he pays much less rent; and if he can get some of his neighbours to swear it as their opinion that the house is worth 10*l.*, he would be registered by Mr. Fogarty. That I take to be Mr. Fogarty's present principle.

2258. Do you conceive that Mr. Fogarty has applied that standard fairly and justly to parties of all political principles?—I do believe that Mr. Fogarty has applied that principle to the best of his judgment in reference to both parties, but the conservative party have upon every occasion opposed the adoption of it as a principle. There is no doubt that where applicants have come forward in that interest, when the principle was adopted by Mr. Fogarty, we did not keep them back, but we have opposed it in every way that we could, and we have been anxious to have the judgment of the superior courts and of a jury, if possible, upon the principles of those decisions.

2259. Did not you state that the lower the franchise, the more serviceable it was to the conservative interest in Belfast?—I was asked whether the lowering of the franchise would not proportionably injure the conservative party, and I repeated that it would not; but I have no hesitation in stating to this Committee, that if the principle is continued of introducing a competition, as it were, in swearing to obtain the franchise, without any regard to the rent the applicant pays for the house, it will be seriously injurious to the conservative interest in Belfast. I may state that many of the electors have stated their cases to me, who paid 8*l.* a year rent, and asked my advice about it; I have invariably declined to advise them one way or the other, in such a serious matter, as to whether they should go forward and swear their houses up to the necessary standard.

2260. In the return you asked the valuers to make for you, of the persons registered under 9*l.* police valuation, did you confine yourself to those registered by Mr. Fogarty, or did you ask for those registered by Mr. O'Dwyer and the other barristers as well?—The list that I made out was confined to those registered by Mr. Fogarty.

2261. What reason had you for not introducing those registered by the others?—I may state to the Committee that I considered the complaints of the conservative party as to the decisions in Belfast to be confined to the period of Mr. Fogarty's registrations, and therefore I confined myself to making out a list of them during that period. There were no complaints made by either party as to the principles of value adopted by the former barristers, Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry, and Mr. Mayne, and therefore I did not direct my inquiries to a subject upon which both parties appeared to be agreed.

2262. Has not there been a comparison made here of the rules laid down by Mr.

Mr. Fogarty, and by Mr. O'Dwyer, and Mr. Mayne, and the other barristers?—Yes, I have myself stated the principles upon which the former barristers acted, and the difference between Mr. Fogarty's practice and theirs.

2263. Would it not have assisted that comparison to have had this return which you have asked for from the valutors to include all?—It might have assisted the inquiry, but to have sent valutors round to make that examination with reference to all the registries that had previously occurred, would have occupied more time than could have elapsed before the examination before this Committee.

2264. Mr. E. Tennent.] Provided you had had the power of taking an appeal from the admissions of Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry, and Mr. Mayne, how many would you have taken?—There was no case occurred before any of those barristers that we would have taken an appeal from on the question of value.

2265. Provided you had an appeal from the admissions of Mr. Fogarty upon the question of value, how many would you have taken?—Certainly we would have appealed in a great number of cases. I would say that, believing as I do that there were a large number of persons registered who did not occupy premises worth 10 *l.* a year, we would have appealed in every one of those cases from Mr. Fogarty's decisions, if we had the right of appeal.

2266. Therefore in the present instance you instituted no inquiry with reference to the persons admitted by Mr. O'Dwyer, because you had no doubt respecting them, but with respect to the persons admitted by Mr. Fogarty you had doubt?—I was perfectly satisfied that every claimant who had a house that was worth 10 *l.* was admitted by Mr. O'Dwyer, and I had the same impression with regard to Mr. Curry and Mr. Mayne's decisions.

2267. Are you aware of any appeal having ever been made from Mr. Fogarty's decisions for want of value?—No.

2268. In no one instance has a claimant conceived himself aggrieved when rejected for want of value?—In no one instance has a claimant appealed who was rejected by Mr. Fogarty for want of value.

2269. Mr. French.] Was there any appeal from Mr. O'Dwyer's rejections for want of value?—No.

2270. Chairmen.] Was there any appeal by any party who had been rejected for want of value by either of the other revising barristers?—No.

2271. Mr. E. Tennent.] You have stated that Mr. Fogarty applied these principles impartially to both conservatives and liberals in Belfast. Are you not aware that a very great impression has existed in Belfast, in court and out of it, that Mr. Fogarty has exhibited a bias towards the liberal party, and that that bias has been evinced in his conduct in some instances?—I have stated already that Mr. Fogarty intended to apply, in my opinion, the principles to both parties; but I have also stated my belief, that by getting into this uncertain mode of proceeding in ascertaining the value, and not taking the rent or some other fact as the standard, a door has been opened by which an assistant barrister may unintentionally lean to favour his own political views, and I do believe that there has been such a leaning, but I will not state that that leaning has been intentional on the part of Mr. Fogarty; however, an impression is entertained that there is such a leaning on his part.

2272. Are you aware of Mr. Fogarty having in one instance required a claimant to prove value, and in another instance, where the rate was less than that which was usually taken as evidence, having adopted a contrary course?—Yes; in the case of Arthur Lavery, which occurred at the January sessions in 1836, Mr. Fogarty required those who opposed the claim to produce evidence in opposition, and took the oath of the claimant as *prima facie* evidence of value. In the case of James Hutton, who applied to be registered in April 1836, although the rent of Hutton's house was 8 *l.*, and the police valuation 5 *l.*, the rent in Lavery's case being 7 *l.*, and the police value 6 *l.*, in Hutton's case Mr. Fogarty required the applicant to produce evidence in corroboration of his own opinion of the value.

2273. Do you recollect by which parties each of those persons were severally brought forward?—Arthur Lavery was produced by the radical party, and James Hutton produced by the conservative party.

2274. Mr. French.] The police valuation in the case of Arthur Lavery was 6 *l.*, and in the other case but 5 *l.* Do not you think that so material a difference in the police valuation would be a sufficient reason for applying a different rule?—No, when the rent in Hutton's case was 8 *l.*, and in Lavery's but 7 *l.*, I would take the rent as a better criterion of the value than the police valuation.

Mr. John Bates.

30 March 1837.

2275. Mr. *M. J. O'Connell*.] There might be fines or some consideration given for an abatement of rent, but the police valuation would admit of no such difference?—In neither of those cases did there appear, upon the examination of the parties, to have been any fine given, or any lease to the parties.

2276. Mr. *French*.] You stated that the rent was a better standard than the police valuation. Now the question is, whether there might not be certain cases in which a fine was paid?—Yes, but such cases as that would be an exception to the general rule.

2277. Mr. *French*.] You alluded to an alteration of the system in the case of Mr. Fogarty. Was that an alteration between January 1836 and April 1836?—It was; but the first case in which Mr. Fogarty applied the principle of receiving the evidence of the applicant as *prima facie* evidence to establish his case was that of Arthur Lavery; and the first case in which Mr. Fogarty laid down the amended principle, as I would call it, of requiring the applicant to give evidence of his value, was that of James Hutton.

2278. Mr. *E. Tennent*.] Lavery was a liberal, and Hutton a conservative?—Yes.

2279. You stated upon a previous day, that in M'Cann's case, Mr. Fogarty postponed the further bearing of it till the claimant could obtain additional evidence. Was he applied to upon any occasion to allow another case to stand over till additional evidence could be produced in opposition to it?—Yes; in the case of James Stevenson, of York-street, who appeared to register in January 1836, such an application was made. I will read the report of the case to the Committee.—“James Stevenson, of York-street, after answering the usual question to the barrister, on his cross-examination by Mr. Whiteside, admitted that he had been rejected at the last sessions on the ground that the barrister did not believe him to be the actual tenant of the premises out of which he sought to register; admitted that the facts of the case were the same now as when he was before rejected; but stated that he was the actual tenant, and produced a receipt given to ‘James Stevenson,’ by Mr. Jonathan Cordukes, his landlord, for the rent. Claimant was asked whether he had not a grown-up son named James Stevenson, residing in the house out of which he sought to register? He said, yes. Asked if he himself paid the rent out of his own money to the landlord? Claimant stated that the rent was paid by the family, and that the receipt was given, not to him, but to his wife by the landlord. In answer to a question from the barrister, stated that he was the same James Stevens mentioned in the receipt shown. It was submitted to the barrister, that as the claimant in this case had been rejected by his learned predecessor, on the ground that he had not been the actual tenant, and as he admitted that he himself did not pay the rent, nor receive the receipt, the case was at the least doubtful, and that he would therefore request him to allow the case to stand over till the arrival of Mr. Cordukes, the landlord, who had been sent for, and would explain whether it was James Stevenson, the claimant, or James Stevenson, the son, who was his tenant. The barrister stated that where there were two members of a family of the same name, he should consider the simple name, without the addition of senior, to answer the elder, and, seeing no reason to postpone the hearing till the arrival of the landlord, would admit the claim. Mr. Whiteside assured the barrister that at a former sessions in this court-house, his learned predecessor, on the grounds of a claimant having sworn that he paid 10*l.* a-year, whilst it was asserted on the contrary that he paid but 8*l.*, allowed the case to stand over till the arrival of the landlord, and the assertion proving false, the claimant was afterwards prosecuted for perjury. He asked not the rejection of the claim, but a postponement, on account of the landlord, who had been already sent for. The barrister saw no cause for delay, and admitted the claimant.”

2280. So that it appears that, in M'Cann's case, Mr. Fogarty allowed the further bearing to be postponed to bring up further evidence in support of the claim, and in Stevenson's case he refused to allow the further hearing to stand over, to bring up further evidence in opposition to the claim?—Yes.

2281. By which party was M'Cann brought up?—By the radical party.

2282. By which party was Stevenson opposed?—By the conservative.

2283. Mr. *French*.] Could not James Stevenson the son have been served instead of James the father, if he had been the tenant?—He could have come forward to register, and in that case James Stevenson the elder should have been rejected.

2284. *Chairman*.] Was James Stevenson the elder, or James Stevenson the younger the tenant?—I do not know which was the tenant. The object was to ascertain

certain from the landlord which was the tenant, because Mr. Mayne had rejected James Stevenson the elder, upon the ground that he was not the tenant.

2285. *Mr. French.*] Is it probable that when both were there, and when either could have come up, that the wrong man would come up? What purpose was answered by it, as they were probably both of the same politics?—I do not know whether they were both of the same politics or not, but the object the postponement was required for, was to ascertain whether it was the right man or the wrong man that was applying.

2286. The case of M'Cann was postponed for the purpose of his bringing up further evidence to convince the barrister of his right to register?—Yes.

2287. Do not you consider that the two cases are very different. In the one case M'Cann having asked for time to bring evidence to prove his right to register, and in the other case the opponents of Stevenson, after the barrister was convinced of his right to register, having called upon the barrister to delay the admission of the man?—I do not consider the cases different. There was this fact in Stevenson's case, that he had been rejected on the ground of his not being the tenant, and upon other evidence by Mr. Mayne, the presiding barrister, and the object of asking for the postponement was to produce the landlord, in this doubtful state of facts, to prove that the applicant was not his tenant.

2288. Had not Stevenson given notice of his intention to register?—James Stevenson had.

2289. And the receipt of the landlord was produced?—The applicant produced a receipt to James Stevenson.

2290. Was not it in the power of the party opposing Stevenson, to have had the landlord there if they thought fit, at the time that Stevenson was before the barrister?—Certainly they might have had him there; but they expected that the decision of the former barrister upon the case would have had sufficient weight with Mr. Fogarty.

2291. But there was additional evidence, there having been no receipt before the former barrister?—I do not know whether the receipt was produced before the former barrister or not.

2292. *Chairman.*] Are the father and the son both of the same name?—Yes; both of the same Christian name.

2293. Then the receipt would not prove whether it was the father or the son that was the tenant?—No.

2294. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Was the landlord at Belfast?—The landlord was in Belfast, and we were prepared to send for him, or had sent for him.

2295. Would any greater delay have taken place by waiting to send for the landlord in Stevenson's case, than there was in sending for the additional evidence M'Cann's case?—No.

2296. *Mr. French.*] Do not you think that an amazing deal of time would be occupied if upon every conjecture the barrister was to hold over cases?—Certainly, if upon every conjecture the barrister was to hold over cases; but upon this case there had been a previous rejection by a predecessor of Mr. Fogarty's, upon the ground for which we contended.

2297. Do not you consider the fact of the man making an application after that objection, with additional evidence, to be strong proof of his being the tenant?—I have already stated, I am not aware whether this receipt was offered in evidence before or not, but the receipt itself was to James Stevenson, without distinguishing which of the James Stevensons; and as to the additional evidence, that might be derived from the circumstance of the man appearing a second time to claim the franchise. I would not place any reliance upon that, because parties will press their claims repeatedly.

2298. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Looking generally at the class of persons who now present themselves for registration, do you conceive that they belong to the same class in point of value to which they belonged during the registration of Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry, and Mr. Mayne?—No, I have already stated that the lower class, in point of value, have appeared to register; and in proof of that statement, I have here a list of seventy persons who did not appear before the former registries to claim the franchise, although they were then in occupation. I will hand in to the Committee a list of the seventy persons to whom that refers, who never applied to the former barristers, in order that the parties may be fully informed of the names and particulars as to those parties; the names are made out with as much accuracy as I possibly could.

Mr. John Bates.

20 March 1837.

2299. Mr. French.] Was there not a great exertion made within the last twelve months to get persons to register?—Yes.

2300. And that will account for persons who might have been rather indifferent as to the registration, and who therefore have not come forward under the former barristers, coming forward at present?—That would account for it in some degree; but I am convinced that many of the parties in that list would not have ventured to apply to the former barristers for registration. And I may also state, that there has been at all times in Belfast, since the year 1832, every exertion by both parties to bring forward their friends for registry.

2301. But have not you admitted that that has been greater within the last twelve months?—I do not say that that has been greater during the last twelve months. I know that I have used the same exertions upon all occasions, and I believe the parties generally have.

2302. You produced, upon the last day, a letter respecting an appeal; have there been any other appeals decided besides the one you then stated?—I have not received a letter from Belfast, stating the particulars of the appeals prosecuted; but I understand from a newspaper report which I have seen, that there were two other appeals.

2303. Do you form that belief from the letter, or from the newspaper?—From the newspaper.

2304. Does the letter state any thing about the confirmation of a decision of Mr. Fogarty in another case?—It does not; but I observe from the newspaper, that in the case in which Mr. Fogarty rejected the applicant on the ground that he had not correctly described his residence, the Chief Baron has affirmed the rejection of Mr. Fogarty.

2305. Mr. E. Tennent.] But there was no reference to that in the letter you produced?—No.

2306. No reference to any cases except those which the Chief Baron had rejected?—No reference to any other cases.

2307. Mr. French.] Did not you state that a case at Dundalk was reserved for the opinion of the twelve judges?—I stated that Mr. Whiteside informed me so from a letter which he had received from Dundalk.

2308. Did not the letter you received the other day state that the Chief Baron mentioned that the case stood over till it was discovered whether the boy was a domestic servant?—Part of the letter that refers to that case I read to the Committee, and the Chief Baron, in that, stated that he had held the case over to satisfy himself of the fact whether the person who occupied the house was a domestic servant or merely a workman. The statement that I made of the case being reserved, I made to the Committee, in consequence of what I understood to be Mr. Whiteside's statement to me as to the contents of his letter; and that statement was certainly more favourable to the views of Mr. Fogarty than if I had stated that the Chief Baron merely held it over to satisfy himself of the fact, whether this was a domestic servant or not.

2309. Are not the two statements inconsistent, the one with the other?—The first statement that I made, I told the Committee at the time, was made from my understanding of a communication that Mr. Whiteside had received, and it was to the effect that I understood the case was reserved for the judges. It now turns out that the Chief Baron did not reserve it for the judges, but merely held it over to satisfy himself of the fact, whether the person who occupied was a mere workman or a domestic servant; because, if a workman only, he would have rejected him at once, which would have been deciding the question as to occupation contrary to the view acted upon by Mr. Fogarty. If I had been in possession of that statement of facts, I would certainly have stated it to the Committee, as, if it had been my object to give any colouring to the facts, it would have been more serviceable to that view than to have stated it in the way of its having been reserved for the judges.

2310. Did not Mr. Fogarty always require that the person should be actually resident?—Mr. Fogarty required that the party should have been for some portion of the time actually resident in the house before claiming the franchise, but he did not require a six months' residence by himself or his domestic servants.

2311. Are you aware of the statement of facts upon which Mr. Hannay's case was decided?—I have no farther information as to the state of the facts in Mr. Hannay's case than that detailed in the letter of Mr. Napier, which I handed in to the Committee.

2312. Are

2312. Are you aware that in the statement agreed upon by both sides the fact of residence was negatived?—No, I am not aware.

2313. You admit that Mr. Fogarty always required actual residence before he registered?—Yes; I have so stated.

2314. You are not aware whether that fact is negatived in the statement of facts laid before the Chief Baron in Hannay's case?—No; the extent of my information is contained in the letter of Mr. Napier, which I have handed in to the Committee.

2315. If the fact of residence was negatived in the statement of facts laid before the Chief Baron, do you think that Mr. Fogarty's principle has been fairly tried?—If the fact of Mr. Fogarty's requiring any portion of residence has been withheld out of the statement of facts, I would say that it has not gone before the court as fully as it ought; but I do consider the Chief Baron's decisions as a reversal of Mr. Fogarty's in this respect. There is six months' possession or occupation required on all hands. Mr. Fogarty requires what he considers a six months' legal possession, and we conceive that a six months' actual occupation is necessary. The question then comes to what is the nature of the occupation that the Act requires; and I consider that the Chief Baron, when he decides that the occupation must be by the tenant himself or by a domestic servant, has decided that Mr. Fogarty's view is wrong.

2316. Are you aware of it having been proposed in open court the first day, that in cases of houses of disputed value, a valuator should be chosen on the part of the conservatives, and a valuator on the part of the liberals, and, in case of their disagreeing, that they should have power to call in a third valuator, and the decision of this valuator to be final as to the value of the houses, and that that was accepted by one party and refused by the conservatives?—There was a proposal made by the radical party, at the registry, to that effect, and it was then refused by the conservative party, because it was impossible to carry it into effect at that registry. I do not recollect whether Mr. Fogarty stated that he would act upon that evidence or not. No correspondence occurred subsequently between the two parties as to whether this principle could be acted upon. At the subsequent registry it was found that the parties could not agree upon the persons who were to act as umpires, a difficulty that I apprehended myself from the beginning. But if the principle could have been acted upon, the conservative party would have been most anxious for the adoption of it.

2317. Was not that proposed a second time and again agreed to by the radical party, and again declined by the conservative party?—As I recollect, it was never offered by Mr. Fogarty. The radical party at the first registry made a proposition of that kind at the registry, at which time it was impossible to act upon it for that registry, because the thing was going on. Previous to the next registry a correspondence was opened between the two parties, when, after several letters passing and the arbitrators meeting, it was found that they could not agree upon the umpire.

2318. Are you aware that, as to Mr. Fogarty agreeing to it, if there was no other evidence produced, he must be ruled by that evidence?—Yes, but that would not preclude the parties themselves from bringing evidence if they pleased.

2319. Could such an agreement as that between the two contending parties bind the claimants?—Certainly, it would not bind the claimants or the registering barrister.

2320. Could the registering barrister legally and judicially take notice of such an agreement?—Not further than taking the evidence of those arbitrators when produced before him, but he could not act upon the decisions of the arbitrators.

2321. In fact would not such an agreement as that have been almost fallacious?—I conceive that it never could have been acted upon for any length of time. We proposed upon our part a most respectable architect, Mr. James Boyd, who is now, I believe, the county surveyor for Mayo, or some of the counties in Ireland. The valuator proposed on the other side was a Mr. M'Cormac, who had been paid for giving evidence at former registries. We waived the difference in their circumstances and professional rank, but it was found when they met that they could not agree upon an umpire, Mr. M'Cormac insisting upon parties as umpires that our party would not agree to.

2322. Mr. Hogg.] If they had agreed as to an umpire, still was not it competent to any person whatever to render that arrangement inoperative as regarded himself?—Certainly, no claimant would be bound by that arrangement. He would

Mr. John Bates.
 do March 1837.

have had a right to produce his own evidence, or the claimant would have a right to bring evidence in support of his own claim, or in opposition to another claimant.
 2323. *Chairman.*] Are the Committee to understand that Mr. Fogarty either directly or indirectly favoured such a proposition?—As I recollect, Mr. Fogarty expressed no opinion at all upon the subject. I do not recollect his expressing any favourable opinion of it, certainly.

2324. *Mr. French.*] Did not all the persons that came forward to register universally come forward under the patronage of one side or the other?—The notion of those parties are served, and the parties themselves brought forward by one party or another, generally speaking; sometimes a party who is doubtful is brought forward by both.

2325. *Mr. M. J. O'Connell.*] Do they ever serve notices for themselves?—Very seldom; scarcely ever.

2326. *Mr. Emerson Tennent.*] Do you recollect what the colourable majority was at Mr. M'Cance's election in the year 1835?—Six.

2327. You have stated that there were a number of persons admitted by Mr. Fogarty, the value of whose tènements has been under 10 l.?—Yes.

2328. In fact, a number of fictitious voters?—A number of what I would call fictitious voters.

2329. Do you conceive that in the event of a contest in any casualty, such as the numbers running very close, that the number of fictitious voters registered by Mr. Fogarty would decide the election?—I do; I conceive that, in the present state of the registry at Belfast, scarcely any party would be satisfied with the result of an election, and that nothing but the expense of a petition would prevent a petition from the defeated party. With regard to the election, I was asked some questions in reference to the numbers who voted at former elections, in a previous part of my evidence, which I was not then able to answer; since that I have ascertained the numbers. At the first election in Belfast, after the Reform Act in 1832, the candidates were Lord Arthur Chichester, James Emerson Tennent, Esq., Mr. Sharman Crawford, and Robert James Tennent. The number who voted for Lord Arthur Chichester was 831; Mr. Emerson Tennent 721; Mr. Sharman Crawford 621; Mr. Robert James Tennent 615. At the election in January 1835, the candidates were Mr. Emerson Tennent, Mr. John M'Cance, Lord Arthur Chichester, and Mr. John French. The number who voted for Mr. Emerson Tennent was 773; for Mr. M'Cance 719; for Lord Arthur Chichester 713; and for Mr. French 3. I give these numbers, because I had from recollection before given the majority of the honourable member for Belfast as larger than it appears to have been. It also appears that at the election in January 1835, about 40 persons did not vote who were entitled to the franchise; the number may however have been a few less. The last election took place in August 1835; the number who voted for Mr. Dunbar was 162, and for Mr. Robert James Tennent 31.

2330. *Mr. M. J. O'Connell.*] You stated that the colourable majority for Mr. M'Cance was six; upon what grounds do you take upon yourself to pronounce that majority to have been a colourable one?—I have not decided any such question. The question of the honourable Member for Belfast included the word "colourable" in it; but I readily adopt it now, because I know that a large number of persons voted in Belfast who had ceased to be entitled to the franchise. The parties are entitled to the franchise as long as they occupy the particular house or premises out of which they register. Several persons, to the amount of about 50, probably, voted for Mr. M'Cance, who had been out of their places, but who, in order to ease their conscience or to protect themselves from a prosecution for perjury, forced their way into the houses, or borrowed the keys of those houses and got into the house, and, after being in a few minutes, went forward to poll, and swore that they were still possessed of the qualification out of which they had registered.

2331. Do you state this from the information of others or from your own knowledge?—From my own knowledge.

2332. *Mr. Emerson Tennent.*] That is one class of objections which may be urged against persons who had no right to vote, and who did vote at the election?—Yes.

2333. You say you have no doubt of that having been a colourable majority?—No doubt.

2334. *Mr. M. J. O'Connell.*] Was there any objection against those persons who voted for the honourable Member and for Lord Arthur Chichester?—I believe there were objections against some of the parties who voted for the honourable Member;

Member; some of the parties who voted for Mr. M'Canee, I believe, also gave the honourable Member a vote; but his majority was so large, that it took it out of any danger in the way of a petition.

2335. His majority upon the poll appears to have been 60 over Lord Arthur Chichester, and you state that 50 of the voters were persons that were not qualified; now can you take upon yourself to say, that none of those persons who were not qualified were among those who voted for the honourable Member for Belfast?—I will state my decided belief that they were; and my decided belief is, that, but for the very heavy expense, a petition would have been prosecuted, on the part of Lord Arthur Chichester and some of the electors, against the return of Mr. M'Canee.

2336. Mr. E. Tennent.] Is it your opinion, that an annual registration would be a desirable thing in Ireland?—I consider that there are few things that would be a more important improvement than having an annual registration. The present system of quarterly registration at the quarter sessions is attended with a great deal of mischief. In the first place, I conceive that the assistant barrister's court is not the place where registration of voters should be carried on. I conceive that it compels the judge of that court to interfere in political matters, greatly to the prejudice of his usefulness in other respects: and the quarterly renewals of the agitation connected with registry is of a most injurious kind; it takes the attention of people from their business, and renews all those annoyances and controversies and disputes which must result from political contests. Besides, if there was an annual registration, it would do away effectually with this system of persons returning to their former residence, and coming forward under fraudulent circumstances to vote; and if an alteration made by a claimant in his house could affect his right to vote, that defect would be cured by an annual registration. But, according to the present system in Ireland, an applicant remains on the poll for eight years after his registry. It seldom happens that he remains so long in his house; and he has his certificate out of the registry; and the returning officer, if he comes forward to vote, has no discretion in the way of refusing his vote, although he should have left his premises. I would state, as another evil of the system of the present registration, that the value of the houses of persons registered may considerably decrease, they may fall down, by going out of repair and other circumstances, to much below 10*l.*; yet still they appear upon the registry, and would be entitled to come forward. In the same way the registry for the borough gets into confusion. At present the number on the register of Belfast exceeds 3,000. If there was an election to-morrow, I am satisfied the parties who would be entitled to vote out of that 3,000 would not be more than 1,000, or thereabouts; and with regard to all the rest of the electors of the borough that might come forward and insist upon their right to vote under their ancient certificates, they would not be entitled.

2337. Chairman.] You mean that the 1,400 electors, who form the difference between the 3,000 and the persons actually entitled, would only be prevented from voting by conscientious scruples?—There would be nothing else to restrain them. If they got so warm in politics as to disregard the sanction of an oath, they might come forward and vote as they did at the election in January 1835.

2338. Mr. French.] All the persons who have been once registered remain on the list for eight years?—Yes.

2339. Chairman.] Have you ever heard of such a thing as a party personating the character of another individual, and voting in the character of that individual?—Yes.

2340. In a large town, such as Belfast, might such a thing be done and escape detection?—It might escape detection at the moment, but not ultimately.

2341. So as to influence the return?—Yes.

2342. Mr. French.] Have you ever heard an instance of the kind since the Reform Bill?—I am not able to state any instance of personation; but with the limited power that the assessor of the returning officer has now, I think that parties might personate an elector.

2343. Mr. M. J. O'Connell.] Do you conceive that the assessor would feel himself bound, under the existing law, to receive the vote of an individual who personated another, without going into any evidence as to the identity of the voter, supposing him to be objected to upon that ground?—I have not heard any point of that description argued, but I believe the assessor has no power to go into evidence; and if a party comes forward and swears that he is the individual named in the certificate,

Mr. John Bates.
 30 March 1837.

tificate, and that he is still possessed of the same qualification, I believe several of the assessors feel themselves bound to admit him.

2344. Do they feel themselves so bound, as not to be able to go into evidence of the person's identity?—I have never known any assessor go into evidence as to the identity.

2345. But you never heard an objection made as to the identity?—I never heard an objection as to identity argued.

2346. Mr. *Emerson Tennent*.] Would not you conceive it an advantage, in any change of the law, that an appeal should be given against admissions as well as rejections?—Certainly; such a power of appeal could not fail to give satisfaction, because it would operate both on the public and upon the registering barrister. The public must feel satisfied with such a system, because, in the event of any person being registered to whom there was a reasonable objection, they would have a remedy, namely, an appeal; and, on the other hand, it would afford that check over the registering barristers which there is over most of the judges in the country, that is, a power of appeal from them.

2347. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] You have said that you never heard of possession being attempted since the Reform Bill at Belfast?—No.

2348. But you did know it before?—Yes.

2349. Mr. *M. J. O'Connell*.] To what tribunal would you give an appeal against the party admitted?—Certainly to the judges of the superior courts in Dublin.

2350. You have just stated, that you thought a jurisdiction of that kind being given to the assistant barrister, as judge of the quarter sessions, has most injurious consequences, by its bringing him into a very invidious position as a judge. Do you then think the position of the judges in the superior courts would be improved by the possession of such a jurisdiction?—Their absence from the immediate place of contest, I think, would in some degree relieve them from that difficulty which is always attendant upon judges having to decide in political matters. I consider that it is objectionable, and ought to be avoided as far as it can in every case; but I think there is no tribunal so fit as the judges of the superior court to decide those questions. They are persons cognizant of all the principles of the law which are necessary to enable them to decide those points. That, coupled with the right of the party to have a jury upon the question of value, would in my mind afford a good guarantee to the public.

2351. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] You do not mean to say, that if the appeal went to any other tribunal a jury might not be impanelled?—Certainly it might.

2352. What do you say to an appeal to the judges of the superior courts upon questions arising in the city of Dublin, where they are always resident, and where therefore that objection would apply, which, according to your notion, applies to the assistant barristers?—I have stated already that I consider it would be better if political questions could be altogether kept from coming under the consideration of the judges of the country, in order to preserve their character. I am not a bit afraid of their purity, but to preserve their character with the people; but I do consider that, under the circumstances of the objections that would lie to various tribunals, there could be no fitter tribunal, and none the public would be more satisfied with, than the judges of the superior courts.

2353. Mr. *M. J. O'Connell*.] Where would you have those appeals tried?—I think the present system of trying them before a judge of assize is the most convenient upon the whole. It would be a great inconvenience to the parties to take them to Dublin, and I would therefore say that the assizes would be the best place to try them.

2354. Is it always convenient to parties to take them to the assize town?—As to matter of convenience, a man who claims a right must submit to some inconvenience in the establishment of it. There will be an inconvenience in the thing; there will be additional trouble in any way.

2355. If an appeal were given, both for and against the franchise, there would be practically a great increase in the number of appeals; in fact, every case that was objected to before the barrister would, where there is a strong party feeling, be taken by one side or other to the assizes?—That would depend upon the opinion which the parties entertained of the soundness of the decision. For instance, at present

present there is a right of appeal upon the part of those rejected. Now it is singular to say, that in Belfast, since 1832, there have been very few appeals prosecuted by those who have been rejected, and I think it is fair to presume that, as a general thing, there would not be more than a doubling of the number in case the right was given to appeal from the registry. Of course, in making these remarks, I do not take into consideration the present circumstances of the parties in Belfast, because I have already stated, that if the right of appeal existed in Belfast, there would have been many appeals during the last year against the registry.

2356. Could not anything vexatious be guarded against by giving costs to the party who was in the right?—Yes.

2357. *Chairman.*] The revising barrister now is the assistant barrister at the quarter sessions?—Yes.

2358. And he is appointed at the will and pleasure of the Government for the time being?—Yes.

2359. The judges are appointed for life?—They are.

2360. Does not that render their decision, therefore, less liable to be swayed by political bias, than the decisions of those individuals who are appointed from time to time by the Government?—Certainly it does; they are independent of the Crown, they are independent of all political parties; but unfortunately it too frequently happens that the appointment of the registering barristers is made on political grounds; at the same time, I believe instances of the removal of assistant barristers from their office are very rare in Ireland.

2361. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Have you ever heard of such a thing as the removal of an assistant barrister from his office at the will of the Crown, without any cause assigned?—I have never heard of any.

2362. Do not you believe that such a thing does not exist at all?—I have never heard or known of an instance of the kind.

2363. *Chairman.*] Are not they sometimes removed from one county to another?—They are; the Crown has the power of removing them; and such a power exercised over them is a matter through which the Crown can exercise an influence, because an assistant barrister may be removed from a county that is more profitable to him to a less profitable one.

2364. Why should one county be more or less profitable than another?—The quantity of civil business done in the county regulates in some degree the income of the assistant barrister as far as fees are concerned.

2365. But in point of fact, supposing a removal does not take place, does not the assistant barrister, from his constant presence in a county, and from his constant communication with persons of the county, become more liable to party suspicions than a judge who only goes the circuit by turns?—He does.

2366. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] What is the usual average of the period during which the assistant barrister remains in the county at each sessions?—Between a fortnight and three weeks.

2367. And that occurs four times in the year?—Yes.

2368. So that the entire is about two months in the year?—Between two months and ten weeks.

2369. And during that period he is occupied nearly the entire of his time in doing the business of the county in court?—Yes, he is occupied the entire of the day-time.

2370. *Chairman.*] How long do the judges usually pass in the county during the assizes?—They go twice in the year; three or four days generally does the assize business of the northern counties.

2371. Then the assistant barrister is from eight to ten weeks in the county, and the judge would be about a week or eight days?—Yes.

2372. Then, practically speaking, does not the assistant barrister have more to do with a variety of matters in the county than the judge has?—He comes more in contact with the people.

2373. Would not, therefore, any jealousy of his party bias be more likely to be injurious, than even with regard to a judge?—I should say so. The evil is this: the assistant barrister comes as it were fresh with his appointment from a particular government, either a conservative government or a whig government, and the impression in many cases unfortunately will be immediately taken up, that he is a partisan of that party. It is true that the superior judges are also appointed by the government, but the rank in which their character stands as judicial men at the

Mr. John Bates.
20 March 1837.

head of the law, removes them from those suspicions in a much greater degree than it can remove the assistant barrister.

2374. Do you conceive that it would be desirable that the registering barrister should be appointed by the judges, in a body who should have no other duties except that of registering votes?—I do.

2375. Giving an appeal against the decisions in the way you have described?—Yes.

2376. Mr. Emerson Tenent.] Would you conceive it desirable to give to claimants the power of summoning witnesses?—Yes, there ought to be a power of summoning witnesses, because parties will not come forward voluntarily to give evidence if they can avoid it.

2377. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You have stated that you considered that it would be right that the registering barristers should be appointed by the judges; substantially then the result would be, that the judges would have the power which the Government now exercises of appointing the persons who are to register?—Yes.

2378. You would transfer that power from the Government to the judges?—I would, be the government what government it might.

2379. You do not state it particularly with reference to the present Government?—Certainly I feel the necessity of it more particularly under the present Government than I would feel under the former administrations that I recollect in Ireland.

2380. What former administrations do you refer to?—I allude to the administration of the Duke of Wellington, and I allude to the administration of Earl Grey.

2381. When you say the Duke of Wellington, do you mean the last administration?—I mean the administration previous to the appointment of Earl Grey.

2382. Do you mean to include among those administrations to which you would give more confidence, the last administration which Sir Robert Peel headed?—Yes.

2383. And you include Earl Grey's administration?—Yes.

2384. And the Duke of Wellington's administration that preceded it?—Yes.

2385. Those three administrations you think might be trusted with the appointment of registering barristers?—No, I have not said any such thing; I stated that I would not even trust it to them; but in the instance of the present Government I feel additional reasons to withhold that power from any government.

2386. Will you state the reasons which are so peculiarly strong against the present Government?—The additional reasons which I would have against the present Government are, the general appointments of the present Government.

2387. You are not satisfied with the general appointments of the present Government; they do not meet with your approbation?—It is not necessary that they should meet with my approbation, but I have been asked an opinion upon the question, and I give a reply.

2388. Have the appointments of the present Government met with your approbation?—No; I have stated that it is not necessary that they should meet with my approbation, nor do I state their not meeting with my approbation as a reason why they are bad.

2389. You were asked to state the peculiar reasons which you conceive make it improper that the present Government should have the appointment of the registering barristers, and you stated that one of them is your disapproval of the appointments which they have made?—Yes, because they have had more reference to the political leanings of the parties appointed by them than, in my humble opinion, to their legal attainments.

2390. Do you mean to state that no previous government entertained the same leaning?—I have no doubt they entertained the same leaning in favour of their party, but I have as little doubt that they never carried it to the same extent.

2391. That is your belief?—That is my opinion.

2392. And accordingly, for that reason you are peculiarly averse to the present Government appointing the registering barristers?—I am averse to all governments having the appointment, and I have stated also, that in the circumstance I have mentioned, I see additional reasons in the instance of the present Government to withhold that power.

2393. Do you see any other reason?—I am not prepared to state any other reason.

reason upon this branch of an inquiry, entered upon, as I conceive, without having much bearing upon the subject before the Committee.

2394. When you spoke of peculiar reasons applicable to the present Government you meant one reason only?—I am only prepared to state one reason at present.

2395. And you cannot think of any other?—I cannot at present think of any additional reason.

2396. And accordingly when you said that there were peculiar reasons applicable to the present Government, you meant that there was one peculiar reason?—Yes; the honourable Member is right in supposing that it should have been the singular rather than the plural in my answer; but he is not to conclude from that, that there are not other reasons; but that I am not prepared to state any other reasons, nor to go into an argument with him upon this subject.

2397. Mr. Hogg.] Can you suggest, in the event of a change in the law, any fixed criterion of value?—As a general principle, I would take the rent as a criterion of the value. In Belfast about nine-tenths of the houses are held by tenants at will; for instance, I would take as a general principle the rent; but where a party paid a less rent than 10*l.*, if he had an interest in the place by reason of a lease or improvements upon it that made it of the annual value of 10*l.*, which he could prove, I would give him the franchise.

2398. But you can suggest no invariable standard?—I cannot suggest any invariable standard, but I would take the rent as in general a good standard, because in ascertaining the rent, there is the landlord whose property the house is, and the tenant who is about to pay the money; and the two parties both interested in the value in opposition to each other, come to an agreement as to what is the real value of the house.

2399. Mr. Serjeant Bull.] What would you say to a system by which the assistant barristers should move in rotation round the country, and not be stationed, as they now are, in particular districts, but move from one to another?—I would consider that an improvement.

2400. You are an attorney; in point of fact, how many appeals in civil bill cases have occurred since Mr. Fogarty became assistant barrister?—Very few.

2401. Would you venture to say that there have been as many as three?—I cannot state the number, but there have been exceedingly few indeed, and I could not venture to say that there have been three; there have been some appeals, but they were appeals upon questions upon which the law was uncertain, and upon which the parties would have appealed in any way that Mr. Fogarty decided.

2402. In point of fact, is it not a test of the capacity and general ability of the assistant barrister to do the duties of his office that you find few or no appeals from his decisions?—It certainly is a test of his ability.

2403. Is it not emphatically the test?—I would consider it the best test of his efficiency.

2404. Did you ever appeal from any decision of Mr. Fogarty's?—No.

2405. You practise a good deal in the county?—I have recently.

2406. Mr. Hogg.] Is there any fixed time for which a gentleman is attached to a particular county as assistant barrister without being removed?—There is no fixed time.

2407. Then, if there be no time fixed, what is the usual time that a barrister remains attached to a particular county?—I could not give any estimate of the time. The removals depend upon the government of the day. A vacancy occurs in a county, and they will possibly remove the assistant barrister of another county to that, or they can move the assistant barristers about as they please.

2408. You have mentioned in the course of your examination the names of Mr. Mayne, Mr. Curry, and Mr. Fogarty; those three changes have been since the passing of the Reform Bill?—Yes; but in the case of Mr. Curry, he died, and Mr. Mayne was removed to another county to make way for Mr. Fogarty.

2409. Have the changes been more or less frequent or about in the usual course since the Reform Bill as preceding it, or has there been any alteration as to the frequency of changes in Belfast?—I think the changes have been more frequent. I may mention, that when I stated that Mr. Mayne was removed to make way for Mr. Fogarty, I meant that it was on his removal that Mr. Fogarty was appointed. There was some change took place at that period in the assistant barristers in Ireland, and Mr. Fogarty was appointed in the place of Mr. Mayne.

2410. The object of the question is, to ascertain whether the changes have

Mr. John Bates.

20 March 1837.

been more or less frequent since the Reform Bill?—They have been more frequent.

2411. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] In point of fact, was there more than one change since the Reform Bill?—There have been more changes than one; I call the death of Mr. Curry and the appointment of Mr. Mayne a change.

2412. The question does not refer to them, but to a change by the government of the country, by the substitution of one man for another. In that sense has there been more than one since the Reform Bill?—In that sense there has been but one; but there have been two appointments by the Government to Belfast, since the passing of the Reform Act.

2413. Have the Government of the country, in more than one instance since the passing of the Reform Bill, substituted one assistant barrister for another in Belfast?—Only in one instance besides the case of Mr. Curry, where death occurred.

2414. Then when you say that the changes have been more frequent since the Reform Bill, the fact is, that since the Reform Bill there has been but one substitution of one assistant barrister for another living assistant barrister, and one substitution of a living assistant barrister for a deceased assistant barrister?—When I spoke of the changes being more frequent, I answered with reference to the question of the honourable Member which did not refer to Belfast only, but it was with reference to Ireland generally I stated that there had been more changes in Ireland since the Reform Act than before that, and I have no doubt that upon an examination such will turn out to be the fact.

2415. Do you happen to know that Mr. Mayne, who was removed from Belfast, was in the habit of going the north-east circuit, in which Belfast was one of the towns?—He was occasionally.

2416. Do you know to what county he was appointed?—Mayo.

2417. Do you know that in point of fact the assistant barristership of Mayo is a more valuable thing than the assistant barristership of Antrim?—I do not.

2418. Can you state that you ever heard an instance in which the Government have removed one assistant barrister from his county and substituted another for him, except either in the case of an assistant barrister going the circuit in which that county was situated, or by the consent of the assistant barrister himself?—I am not aware of the grounds upon which removals have taken place, but I have already stated it as my belief, that the removals have been more numerous latterly. In reference to the case of Mr. Mayne, although he went that circuit, Mr. Mayne did not practise in the county of Antrim; I think I never saw him hold a brief in the county of Antrim; his connexions lie at the Dublin end of the circuit.

2419. Do you know that a rule was adopted by Government that the assistant barristers should not continue in counties which belonged to the circuit that they went?—I heard that such a rule had been adopted.

2420. Do you know that in the case of Mr. Mayne that rule was acted upon?—I know that that was the reason assigned for his removal.

2421. Have you ever heard of an instance in which the Government have removed an assistant barrister from his county against his will, except in conformity to that rule?—No; not to my recollection; but the Committee are not to understand me to say that such cases have not occurred.

2422. Do you believe that such a thing has occurred?—My belief is, that removals have taken place latterly on political grounds. Whether they had those circumstances to support them that the honourable Member refers to, I do not know. But while I state that as my belief, I have at present no instances in my recollection to state to the Committee upon the subject.

2423. The question is, whether you believe that in any instance an assistant barrister has been removed from his county against his will, except in conformity with the rule you have been speaking of?—I do not know any instance; and therefore I will not take upon me to express any belief upon the subject.

2424. Can you form any belief one way or another?—No, I cannot.

2425. Chairman.] Who was assistant barrister before Mr. Mayne?—Mr. Curry.

2426. How long was Mr. Mayne assistant barrister?—Mr. Mayne was assistant barrister from the middle of 1834 till October 1835.

2427. Who was in office when Mr. Mayne was appointed?—It was Lord Melbourne, I believe.

2428. Who

2428. Who was in office when Mr. Fogarty was appointed?—Lord Melbourne was also in office, but it was during the present administration that Mr. Fogarty was appointed.

2429. Do you mean to say that Lord Melbourne was first Minister in April 1834?—I do not recollect, just now, who was first Minister in April 1834; but it was by the Ministry of that day that Mr. Mayne was appointed.

2430. Who was the assistant barrister before Mr. Curry?—Mr. Green or Mr. Freeman, and Mr. Dobbs before them.

2431. How long was Mr. Green assistant barrister?—I am not prepared to state how long the previous barristers remained in office.

2432. Was Mr. Dobbs Mr. Freeman's immediate predecessor?—No, there was Mr. Green and Mr. Tickle.

2433. Then those three changes, Mr. Green, Mr. Freeman, and Mr. Tickle, all intervening between Mr. Dobbs and Mr. Curry, had taken place before the Reform Bill?—Yes.

2434. Are any of those parties dead?—No.

2435. *Chairman.*] Has Mr. Dobbs gone to another circuit?—Mr. Dobbs has retired.

2436. Mr. Green is made a serjeant?—Yes.

2437. Does that promotion require the resignation of the office of assistant barrister?—Upon being appointed serjeant they generally resign the office of assistant barrister.

2438. *Mr. M. J. O'Connell.*] Do you mean to state that Mr. Green resigned that office upon being appointed serjeant?—The first appointment that Serjeant Green got was as advising lawyer at the Castle; and I think, upon his appointment to that office, he resigned the assistant barristership of the county of Antrim.

2439. In point of fact, was not Mr. Green's appointment to the serjeantship one of the last acts in Ireland of the Melbourne Ministry, before Sir Robert Peel came into office?—I cannot say; I know that he resigned the assistant barristership of the county of Antrim, I believe, upon his getting an appointment about the Castle, but I am quite unprepared to state the date of Mr. Green's promotion.

2440. *Mr. Hogg.*] When he left the county of Antrim, was it a change from being assistant barrister of the county to being assistant barrister of another county; or was it that he ceased to be assistant barrister at all?—He ceased to be assistant barrister at all.

2441. With respect to Mr. Tickle, was it a transfer from one county to another?—It was a transfer to another county.

2442. As to Mr. Freeman?—Mr. Freeman's was a transfer to another county.

2443. When was the rule adopted that has been adverted to, as to assistant barristers not being permitted to be upon their own circuit?—I believe in the end of 1835; it was stated to be adopted by the present administration.

2444. *Mr. Emerson Tennent.*] You stated with regard to appeals from the decisions of Mr. Fogarty in civil business, that none have occurred in the county of Antrim?—I stated very few. I am not aware of any appeals, except those upon questions where either party would have appealed whatever the decision had been.

2445. And that you would regard as evidence of Mr. Fogarty's abilities, and his qualifications for the office of assistant barrister?—Yes.

2446. There have been appeals from his decisions as a registering barrister?—Yes.

2447. Do you remember how many?—I believe the appeals prosecuted have been about four or five.

2448. In how many cases have his decisions been reversed?—In three. I think there were four appeals prosecuted.

2449. So that giving satisfaction as a barrister in civil business, the only branch of the law in which Mr. Fogarty appears to take an erroneous view is the Reform Act?—Yes.

2450. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] In point of fact, in civil bill cases politics do not much intervene?—No.

2451. And in registry cases politics do much intervene?—Yes.

2452. One of the appeals which was disposed of the other day, in which Mr. Fogarty's decision was reversed, was a case which you spoke of, in which Magee, a liberal, was rejected by Mr. Fogarty?—No; the case as I understood, that was disposed

Mr. John Bates.

disposed of the other day, was that of Robert Moore of Ballymacarrett, who was a conservative.

20 March 1837.

2453. Are you quite sure of that?—As far as information has reached me from a newspaper report, that was the case of Moore of Ballymacarrett; it was a question upon the identity of a house.

Martis, 21^a die Martii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Sergeant Bail.
Mr. French.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Hogg.

Mr. M. J. O'Connell.
Lord Granville Somerset.
Mr. Miles Gaskell.
Mr. Emerson Tennent.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

James Whiteside, Esq., called in, and Examined.

J. Whiteside, Esq.

2454. *Chairman.*] YOU are a barrister?—I am.

2455. Practising in Ireland?—Yes.

2456. Have you been engaged in any of the registry courts?—I have.

2457. For one political party or for both?—For one.

2458. For which?—I have been concerned for the conservative party in Belfast, at the first general registration under the Reform Bill, which lasted about a month or better, and I have been concerned at about twenty registry sessions since. I was concerned during the registries of Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry, Mr. Mayne, and Mr. Fogarty. I was absent, I think, once or twice from the sessions.

2459. Mr. E. Tennent.] From what you state as to the length of time during which you have been in the habit of attending the registries in Belfast, you have a very extensive knowledge of the present state of the registry?—All that practising in the court can give me I have.

2460. Will you state as briefly as possible what the principles were upon which Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry, and Mr. Mayne acted upon the questions of occupation and value? Take first the question of value.—As to the question of value, the practice of those three gentlemen appeared to me to be pretty much the same, and that was this:—they adopted the rent as the criterion of the value as a general rule, and whenever a case occurred of a person paying 8*l.* or 9*l.* rent, and the police tax proportionable thereto, they required evidence of a clear and strong character to prove the value before they would admit the claimant. That may be illustrated, as far as Mr. O'Dwyer is concerned, by a case which may have been mentioned to the Committee (Billington's case), which was the first case that created a controversy in Belfast, and that shows clearly what Mr. O'Dwyer's principle of practice was, for in that case I was contending in favour of the vote; the police tax was 6*s.*, and the rent he paid was 10*l.* 10*s.* With great difficulty, and after great argument, the claim was admitted. Mr. O'Dwyer subsequently found himself embarrassed by that as a precedent, for, of course, on each side, we insisted that Billington's case was a precedent for admitting any person who paid such a police tax as 6*s.* He at once saw that that would lead him to admit claimants that had no title to the franchise. Having personally inspected Billington's house, he decided to admit the claim, and he afterwards refused to admit cases where the police tax was so low as 6*s.*, as a general rule, without the most powerful evidence to sustain the value.

2461. Mr. M. J. O'Connell.] Do you mean to say that Mr. O'Dwyer generally excluded persons who paid so low a police tax as six shillings?—I should be surprised if a single case could be produced, except where a fine was paid, out of the 1,700 cases that gentleman admitted, where the party took the house at a recent period for 8*l.* or 9*l.* rent, and where Mr. O'Dwyer admitted him; unless there were some special circumstances I should be very much surprised indeed.

2462. The question is as to the police tax?—If the police tax was low and the rent above 10*l.*, he may have admitted the claim in some instances, but if the police tax was six shillings or beneath it, so far as my recollection serves me, in no case was the claim admitted unless the rent was such as to satisfy him that the man had a substantial

substantial claim to the franchise; Mr. O'Dwyer held the rule very tight indeed in that respect; so much so, that I do not think if there had been a most rigid scrutiny, there would have been found one unsound vote.

2463. In the *Ulster Times* of January 5th, there is a report of an argument of yours in favour of a claimant of the name of Leeson, and you are reported to say this: "Mr. Whiteside remarked upon the absurdity of this man's valuation. The landlord asked 9*l.*; the tenant paid it; the police valuers, impartial judges, fixed its taxes at 6*s.*; they always fixed the taxable value something below the real value; and yet this man came forward to swear it was not worth 6*l.*," and so on; is that a fair report of your argument upon that occasion?—I believe it is.

2464. Are those merely your professional arguments, or do you identify yourself with those sentiments?—I argue every case in the best way I can for my clients; I argued that case upon the principles upon which I had heard Mr. Fogarty decide. He had repeatedly before decided, that where the rent was 9*l.* or 8*l.* parties might be admitted if they gave it as their judgment that the house was worth 10*l.*; and where cases came up on our side which involved the same state of facts, I made use of every argument that I could to get them admitted, and Mr. Fogarty did admit them.

2465. Then, in fact, your only objection to the admission of such cases is, where the parties are of different political sentiments from that of your party?—Not at all; I have not said any such thing; I object to the principle just as much; I know nothing of the majority either one way or another; but, giving my opinion with the greatest deference and respect to Mr. Fogarty, I certainly state to the Committee that I think the principle wrong.

2466. Mr. E. Tennent.] Would you have ventured before Mr. O'Dwyer, to have put such an argument as you did before Mr. Fogarty, or would it be likely to have had the slightest weight?—I dare say I would have put every argument that occurred to me, but my belief is that it would not have succeeded before Mr. O'Dwyer.

2467. Chairman.] You say that you advanced arguments in support of this vote, not in accordance with your own opinion, but in accordance with the opinion that you supposed the assistant barrister to lay down?—Precisely so; I was in favour of the vote, and Mr. Fogarty admitted that vote fairly in consistency with his own principles.

2468. Of course it is your object to make use of such arguments as you think will have effect upon the party you are addressing?—Just so.

2469. But you did not identify yourself with the opinions you advanced?—Certainly unless I have authorities to sustain me, any arguments I may raise to a judge would be of very little value indeed; but when based upon authority, then the argument comes with weight.

2470. Mr. Hamilton.] Your argument arose out of his previous decisions?—It did; the practice of the three former gentlemen we have no doubt about at all, the practice of Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry, and Mr. Mayne; I practised before those three, and saw, I suppose, nearly 3,000 cases decided by them, and as I understood their practice, it was what I have already stated, that the rent in general was a safe criterion of the value, particularly with respect to those 10*l.* householders; it occasionally happened that a man paid a fine, and then of course they went into the circumstances to show that the fine made the 5*l.* or 6*l.* a year rent a reasonable rent; and occasionally it happened that a man had made improvements, and of course they took into the value the improvements; but up to that time I understood that to be the criterion, and that the burden lay upon the claimant to establish his case, not upon the opposing party to resist it.

2471. Mr. E. Tennent.] Did you find it Mr. O'Dwyer's practice to be content with the assertion of the claimant himself as to his own opinion of the value of the house?—Certainly not; he did not mean to cast any imputation upon the claimant, but it was just in this way; taking the payment of 10*l.* rent in the ordinary class of cases to be a *prima facie* proof of the party's claim to register, then, by the converse of the proposition, the not paying the 10*l.* a year rent, was proof that it was not of that value; consequently the parties understood the general rule, and they did not apply unless they paid the rent, or unless they had facts and evidence to show how the fact really stood.

2472. Have you extensive personal acquaintance throughout Belfast?—I have on both sides a great number of personal friends.

2473. Can you state whether the result of this principle, as acted upon by Mr. O'Dwyer,

J. Whiteside, Esq.

21 March 1837.

O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry, and Mr. Mayne, gave general satisfaction to both parties:—I can safely assert, that I never heard in any society the slightest feeling of discontent expressed at the decisions upon that question of value; and though I watched for the party who did me the honour to employ me, with the closest attention, every gentleman's decision before whom I appeared, I could not, in any one instance, conscientiously advise parties to incur the expense of an appeal from any one rejection of Mr. O'Dwyer's upon the score of value, or upon Mr. Curry's or Mr. Mayne's, and there never was an appeal from any of their rejections. I never took an appeal, and I know that there never was an appeal taken by the very experienced gentleman that was counsel against me.

2474. Are you in habits of intimacy with some of the most respectable families in Belfast of opposite politics?—Yes; I am in habits of intimacy with some of them, and respect them highly.

2475. With some of the leaders of the two parties?—Yes.

2476. Do you think that Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry, or Mr. Mayne's principles gave dissatisfaction to any of them?—No; I never heard the slightest feeling of discontent expressed upon that question.

2477. Then your impression would be, with regard to the persons registered by those three gentlemen, that there existed under their officiation a *bona fide* 10*l.* constituency in Belfast?—I think it was as sound a constituency as any in the British empire. There were some evils incident to the unfortunate system of registration in Ireland, for which no gentleman is responsible, because at the election of Mr. McCance, by the necessary casualties of death, removals and absence, there were many voters who came forward with their certificates; some who had given them, in fact, to other persons who personated them. That was in consequence of the unfortunate state of the law at the time. I was then counsel for Mr. Dunbar and Mr. Tennent, and I was informed that, upon that occasion, persons came forward and personated others, and persons voted who had left their houses. But that does not refer to the question of registration at all.

2478. You say that at that time it was as sound a constituency as any in the British empire; would you apply that phrase to the registered constituency of Belfast at the present day?—So far as I can form an opinion from the cases heard in court, as I know nothing myself of the actual value of houses from inspection, I should think many of the cases admitted are cases of great doubt on the question of value; cases in which I would advise an appeal, if I had the means of appealing in every one of them, from the admissions.

2479. And you have already stated that you would not have advised an appeal from the admissions of Mr. O'Dwyer?—I have already stated that I would not. I have a distinct recollection of objecting to a man admitted by Mr. Fogarty, who had been rejected on the question of value by Mr. O'Dwyer, and I think by Mr. Mayne,—I do not know as to Mr. Curry,—and who had appealed; I know that such persons are now on the list.

2480. Are you prepared to state to the Committee any cases illustrative of Mr. Fogarty's principle on the question of value?—A case was shown me yesterday which I think does illustrate that, that is the case of Campbell. "Francis Campbell, Hercules-street, butcher, claimed to be registered out of a house in Hercules-street; is in occupation four years; his house is worth 10*l.* yearly to him; pays 6*s.* police tax, and 7*l.* 16*s.* rent; his taxes are paid. Cross-examined by Mr. Whiteside: Is a butcher; has a shop and kitchen below, and one room upstairs; it is worth 10*l.* a year to him; would not leave it for 10*l.*; cannot say what a solvent tenant would give for it; will not swear it worth 10*l.* except to a butcher. Mr. Whiteside having submitted to the court that the Act required that the qualification should be of the clear yearly value of 10*l.*, Mr. Fogarty stated he would in this case, as the rent and taxes were so low, require evidence to corroborate claimant. Arthur Rice was examined in support of claim: Knows Campbell's house; does not know the actual value, but would give 10*l.* a year for it as a butcher; will not swear it worth 10*l.* to a solvent tenant. Cross-examined: Lives in same street; is a butcher himself; pays 14*l.* for his own house; it is a good street for business; was not up stairs in Campbell's; there is no increase of value in that street for some time past. William Campbell, examined in opposition to the applicant: Lives in Hercules-street; is a butcher; knows Campbell's house; will not swear it value or not value for 10*l.*; if a person wanted a house and could get no other, he might give 10*l.*; does not wish to give any opinion on the subject. William Smith examined: Is an architect; examined Campbell's house

house on two occasions; it is not worth 10 *l.*; it is a very small house; shop and kitchen with very small yard; one room up-stairs; found it difficult to get up, staircase being so narrow; the house altogether is in miserable repair." The argument is not worth while to trouble the Committee with; I stated that the man had been rejected by Mr. Fogarty at the preceding sessions upon the very ground of want of value. That illustrates the case completely.

2481. *Chairman.*] Was there any evidence offered in the last sessions, when that man was admitted, which had not been offered at the previous sessions?—I rather think the person he brought along with him, Arthur Rees, was not examined at the first session.

2482. In that case the rent was 7 *l.* 16 *s.* Do you know what the police valuation was?—6 *l.*

2483. And Campbell had been rejected by Mr. Fogarty before?—He had, the very sessions preceding.

2484. Had he been refused by any preceding barrister?—I do not know that he ever applied before.

2485. And that was one of the cases in which you conceived a fictitious voter to have been placed upon the register?—Upon the ground I have already stated, it appears to me to be one of the worst cases of that description. Without meaning to say that a man cannot come forward a second session, I do not know what the benefit of an appeal to a jury is if when a man has been rejected by a jury in July he can come forward in October. It appears to me that in such a case the man ought to be left to his remedy by appeal.

2486. *Mr. M. J. O'Connell.*] Is it not a fact that in an appeal you are obliged to produce only the same evidence which you have produced before, whereas by coming forward again you can bring fresh evidence?—Not at all. I do not think the principle applies even to a case in the House of Lords; but as to one of those cases, when a jury is impanelled to try the value, every witness that the party can examine he may.

2487. Does not it save time?—It often loses time, and in this case the claimant lost time because the judge was there six weeks after the decision, and he might then have brought his claim on at once; but that he does not do, he waits till the next registry.

2488. Where are the assizes?—At Carrickfergus.

2489. At what distance is that from Belfast?—Eight or nine miles.

2490. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Is not there a very sufficient reason for not appealing to the judge, but taking the chance of a second hearing before the barrister on this ground? If you appeal to the judge and fail, there is an end of your case; whereas if you go before the barrister, and he decides against you, you can then appeal to the judge, so that there are two chances in one case, and only one chance in the other?—I am not sure that there is any thing in the Reform Bill to say, although it would be a very suspicious fact against a claimant, that a jury had found the fact against him; that verdict precludes him from ever applying again; but were the fact to be so, that is an additional reason, in my judgment, for the barrister to reject him, because the tribunal of a judge and a jury is the most satisfactory to all parties; and in a case where a man pays 7 *l.* 16 *s.* rent, I think the fact is so strong against his claim, that I would leave him to make out his case before a jury. It saves the barrister a great deal of trouble.

2491. Can you find any difficulty in accounting for a person claiming a right to vote, preferring taking two chances of establishing his right instead of one?—If the fact were as it is put in the question, I think he would have two to one; and I can perfectly understand why he should avoid going to a jury, because I know what the result would be.

2492. *Mr. Emerson Tennent.*] Do you conceive that in a case of clear yearly value such chance would be worth consideration?—I never heard the chance calculated upon in any way; the oath administered to the jury is to try the other question, but the Lord Chief Justice of the Common Pleas impanelled them to try whether a responsible and solvent tenant would pay 10 *l.* a year for the house.

2493. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Does not that apply only to county registers?—I do not know; but the same principle would apply in a borough.

2494. Was not that in the case of a country 10 *l.* freeholder that the Chief Justice said that?—It may be so; but that makes no difference, because there is no form of oath given either for the county or for the boroughs.

2495. *Mr. French.*] Are not you aware that there is a very sufficient reason for

J. Whiteside, Esq.

21 March 1837.

for preferring coming a second time before the barrister in place of appealing to a judge, under the circumstances of the expense the applicant is put to in attending the assizes, and bringing his witnesses and all the necessary expenses?—If those facts were so, no doubt that would be a reason; but as far as I have had any experience, the expenses and those things are borne by the parties on each side, and in the next place those cases are generally disposed of with the civil bill appeals, which is done the first morning the judge comes into court.

2496. Mr. Serjeant *BeZL*] Even supposing the expense to be borne by a stock purse, still the applicant is never reimbursed for his loss of time and loss of business?—He would certainly have to drive down to Carrickfergus.

2497. What power has he to compel witnesses to attend?—None; but that applies to a case before the assistant barrister, because he has no power of compelling witnesses.

2498. But in one case the witnesses are upon the spot, and in the other case they must go to a distance?—They must go eight miles.

2499. And he has no power to compel them?—No.

2500. Then is not that a good reason for an applicant preferring to take his chance before the barrister, rather than go before a judge by way of appeal?—Those things may operate in some slight degree, but in the lodger case I know that the expense was not borne by the individual; but the prominent reason why parties take care not to go before a jury and judge, is this, that they prefer taking their chance at the quarter sessions; and I may add this, that if it be decided that every man may come forward as often as he pleases, session after session, the registration of electors will become endless; because though a barrister may decide this session, upon a full examination of the facts, that a man is not entitled to registration, if the principle be held that he may come at the next session without any suspicion against him, it appears to me that the power of appealing is altogether useless, and the registration endless.

2501. You stated that there was no form of oath given by the Reform Bill for an applicant to register; are you aware that there is a form of oath given by the Relief Bill?—The statute will speak for itself. I did not understand that to be the principle upon which he decided it. Chief Justice Doherty was, I believe, the framer of the 10th of George 4th, chapter 8. In that statute the criterion of value is laid down to be the rent which a solvent and respectable tenant would pay. The oath which is scheduled to the statute is drawn in such a way that the jury are to try the question of value by that standard; and when this question, under the present Reform Bill, came before the judges upon circuit, there being no form of oath provided by the present Reform statute, the Chief Justice of the Common Pleas conceived that the statute did not contradict the former statute in this respect, and he administered the oath to the jury to try the question of value by what a respectable and solvent tenant would give for the premises.

2502. Do you recollect that that applies exclusively to freeholds in counties?—No, I do not.

2503. In Campbell's case you stated that the applicant was rejected in the first instance by Mr. Fogarty; were you present at the time of the rejection?—Unquestionably, and resisted it.

2504. Do you recollect that Mr. Fogarty stated that he would not register him without some corroborating testimony?—I do not recollect that circumstance; I thought it a most reasonable rejection, and in fact I thought that Mr. Fogarty at the last sessions (I must state certainly in justice to him) adopted a far wiser principle than the principle he laid down at first, because I understood the principle he acted upon at the first session to be, that it depended upon the assertion of the claimant himself, independently of the question of rent, unless contradicted. Mr. Fogarty said, "It is some evidence for me, therefore I call upon you to rebut that case;" but subsequently he went upon a sounder principle of requiring other evidence, and I have no doubt that in that case he may have required other evidence besides the man paying such a rent as 7 *l.* 16 *s.*

2505. Then upon the first occasion there was no corroborating evidence?—I dare say none.

2506. Upon the second occasion there was corroborating evidence?—Yes.

2507. Mr. *Hogg*.] Do you remember any instance in which Mr. Fogarty admitted a claimant whose rent was under 10 *l.* and the police tax under 8 *l.* upon his own evidence, without being supported by the evidence of neighbours or others?—Certainly, I have not the slightest doubt of that fact. I remember cases myself where

where the rent was nine guineas, and the police tax was only 7 s. 6 d., and Mr. Fogarty said that was near 10 l.; and I contended that near the standard was not the actual standard, and that he had no more right to go 10 s. below the actual standard than 9 l. 10 s. below.

2508. Mr. Emerson Tenement.] Do you recollect Mr. Fogarty's stating that if a man presented himself paying but 2 l. rent, and that his house he conceived to be worth 10 l., he would register that man?—No, he did not say that; I put that proposition in the course of the discussion. Where a party came forward who paid a less rent than 10 l., I contended that as the payment of 10 l. a-year rent would be *prima facie* evidence of value, the circumstance of not paying 10 l. a year rent was evidence that it was not the value. Then Mr. Fogarty said, "He has sworn it." Then I said, "Suppose a man paid but 2 l. a year rent, and was willing to swear that it was worth 10 l.?" Mr. Fogarty said he would take it upon his evidence unless contradicted.

2509. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did not he say, "If he explained it satisfactorily to me even upon his own evidence I might admit him?"—I do not remember those words, but I dare say he meant to imply that.

2510. That if he satisfied the mind of the judge upon his oath that the house was worth 10 l. he would register him?—I have no doubt that that may have been implied, but I do not remember that being expressed.

2511. Did not he say that or something like it?—I do not recollect any such thing.

2512. Something to that effect, that the mere circumstance of a man paying but 2 l. rent would not preclude the barrister from registering him if, upon his oath, he satisfied the barrister that the house was worth 10 l.?—My recollection of the occurrence is what I have just stated; I recollect it in no other way. There was a claimant paid a less rent than 10 l., and I was pressing it upon the barrister that that was evidence that it was not worth 10 l.; I said then, "If a man said he paid but 2 l. a year, would you admit him?" Mr. Fogarty said, "Yes, if he swore to it, unless you contradicted it."

2513. Do you mean to say that Mr. Fogarty laid down this as a rule, that he would register a man who paid but 2 l. rent upon his own statement, unless there was contradictory evidence?—I mean to say that I understood Mr. Fogarty's principle, acted upon in many cases at the first registry sessions, to have been this: that if the claimant swore distinctly that the house was worth 10 l. a year, no matter what the rent might have been, he would admit that claimant unless we were prepared with evidence to contradict it, and grounded it upon this principle, that his swearing was some evidence, and that it lay upon us to contradict that evidence.

2514. Do you mean to say that Mr. Fogarty stated that he would not require corroborative evidence in such a case as this?—I will not say that he said that he would not require it, but that he did not require it; he certainly did not say I will never require corroborating evidence.

2515. Then the result is, that Mr. Fogarty stated, that there might be cases in which, where the applicant's rent was 2 l., he would be satisfied with the oath of the applicant that the house was worth 10 l., unless contradictory evidence were given?—I do not recollect anything about his saying that there might be cases; but I think that this ought not to be pressed against Mr. Fogarty, because it was put by me in argument at the moment, and Mr. Fogarty may have said what is repeated, and I believe did so.

2516. Mr. Emerson Tenement.] The report is this: "Arthur Lavery, Samuel-street, examined by the barrister, stated that his house was worth 10 l. a-year, and that he had been six months in actual occupation. On cross-examination, he stated that he paid 7 l. a year rent, and 5 s. 6 d. police tax. Mr. Whiteside then called on the barrister to require further evidence from the claimant as to the value of his house. The barrister said, 'No; I will admit him on his own testimony, unless evidence be produced to contradict him.' Mr. Whiteside contended that the barrister was not bound to credit an incredible thing; and that the circumstance of a person paying but 7 l. a year rent was of itself *prima facie* evidence that the house was not value for 10 l. a year. The barrister said: 'In every instance in which the party himself swears that the house is worth 10 l. a year, I will admit his vote, unless the contrary be proved.' Mr. Whiteside: 'No matter whether the rent he pays is so low as 2 l.?' Barrister: 'Yes.'" Is that, so far as you recollect it, a correct account of what passed upon that occasion?—According to my
0.39. recollection

J. Walsley, Esq.
21 March 1837.

recollection it is correct, and we had the evidence and gave it, and Mr. Fogarty rejected the vote.

2517. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you know this paper called the Guardian?—I know there was such a paper; I believe it is defunct now.

2518. Do you know who gave that report?—Mr. Bates informs me that he gave it himself to the Chronicle.

2519. Your attention is requested to this: "The barrister said, 'In every instance in which the party himself swears that the house is worth 10 l. a year, I will admit his vote, unless the contrary be proved.'" Will you take upon you to say from your recollection that Mr. Fogarty used those expressions?—My impression is, that the report is correct. I kept no memorandum or record of the proceedings. I was engaged in discussing every case as it arose, and they came up with great rapidity. My recollection upon hearing that is, that that was the principle that Mr. Fogarty laid down. I cannot speak to the precise words.

2520. Do you understand by that sentence, "In every instance in which the party himself swears that the house is worth 10 l. a year, I will admit his vote, unless the contrary be proved;" supposing that to have been what Mr. Fogarty said, do you understand that he meant that he would take the oath of the party himself without corroborating testimony?—I understood that to be his principle; I may be wrong; but I left the court that day under the impression that the principle we had been before acting upon was reversed, and that thenceforward the burden of disproving the case lay upon the opposing party, and that it did not lie upon the claiming party to establish his claim by evidence.

2521. Is it your recollection that Mr. Fogarty either expressed or implied that he would take the oath of the applicant himself, without corroborating testimony in every instance, provided he swore that it was worth 10 l. a year?—I have already answered, that I believe that that report is correct. I do not know what emphasis is laid upon the words "every case;" a case might have occurred of such an extraordinary nature that it could not possibly be admitted, but my belief is, that he stated that the claimant himself could establish his case, independently altogether of the question of rent, whether 2 l., 3 l., 4 l., 5 l., or 6 l., or 8 l. rent.

2522. Will you give an answer distinctly to the question whether it is your recollection that that Mr. Fogarty laid down the following principle: That in every instance in which the applicant would swear that his house was worth 10 l. a year, he, Mr. Fogarty, would register him without any corroborating testimony, unless contradictory evidence were given on the other side?—That is my distinct recollection of the principle that Mr. Fogarty laid down; but as I have already stated three times to the Committee, my impression was, that where a party came forward who paid a rent of 7 l. or 8 l. or 9 l., and distinctly swore that in his opinion his house was worth 10 l. a year, then the burden lay upon the opposing party to resist that claim, and every other person upon my side laboured under the same impression.

2523. Your attention is called emphatically to the words "in every instance."—I have already stated that I believe that report to be correct. I do not know what is the meaning of "in every instance."

2524. Mr. E. Tennent.] Are you likewise prepared to state that that principle was acted upon by him at that sessions?—In the very case itself it was acted upon, because that is a case in which a man comes forward paying 7 l. rent, and he is asked did he pay a fine? He says, "I have paid no fine, but in my opinion the house is worth 10 l. a year." I deny that it can be worth 10 l. a year, because I say that the rent is the criterion of value. I call upon the barrister to require evidence to corroborate the statement of the claimant. He refuses to do so. Then that argument arises, and we give evidence that it is not worth 10 l. a year, and that decides the question.

2525. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You are speaking now of the first sessions. Now did not Mr. Fogarty, at the first sessions, reject applicants who stated upon their oath that their houses were worth 10 l. a year, when there was no corroborating testimony?—I have no recollection of the fact.

2526. Do you recollect the case of Campbell the butcher?—That was not rejected at that session at all. That was three sessions after. I say that Mr. Fogarty laid down a much better rule two sessions after, for he did reject that man two sessions after.

2527. Will you undertake to say that Mr. Fogarty did not reject applicants at

the registry at the first sessions, when parties swore that their tenements were worth 10 *l.* a year, and did not corroborate their swearing by other evidence?—I have no recollection of the fact.

2528. *Mr. Hamilton.*] With respect to corroborating evidence, of course you do not mean to exclude the evidence afforded by rent or taxes, if generally favourable to the claimant?—Certainly not.

2529. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] When Campbell's case first came forward he had no corroborating evidence, and the second time he came forward he had corroborating evidence, and it appears that part of the evidence opposed to the applicant was to this effect: One of the witnesses, William Campbell, said that he would "not swear it value or not value for 10 *l.*," and he proceeded, "if a person wanted a house and could get no other he might give 10 *l.*;" and it was notwithstanding such evidence as that, that Mr. Fogarty admitted the party?—I do not mean to set up that case at all as against Mr. Fogarty, for I conceive that Mr. Fogarty's original judgment in that case was right, and I think no man could have quarrelled with it. I think that the fact of the rent being 7 *l.* 16 *s.* and the first rejection standing against him, and another witness swearing that it was not worth 10 *l.* a year, made it upon the whole such a case as might fairly be sent to a jury.

2530. You take into account that that first rejection was a rejection in a case where there was no corroborating evidence whatever?—Yes, I admit that.

2531. *Mr. Hogg.*] In that first 7 *l.* case did Mr. Fogarty expressly state, before you adduced the evidence in opposition, that unless you did adduce evidence in opposition he would admit the claim?—Unquestionably, I did not produce the evidence until I heard that stated.

2532. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Do you mean to lay it down as a general opinion, that if the weight of the evidence, according to the judgment of the barrister, is in favour of the applicant, yet he ought not to register him, but to send him to a jury, merely because there is contradictory swearing?—No; but if there be a fact that cannot be mistaken, such as the rent, which proves the opinion of the landlord and of the tenant, and it is a recent take, it would strike my humble judgment that that is a case that ought to be sent to a jury.

2533. That is to say, if the circumstances of the case be such as ought to coerce the mind of the barrister, that the tenement is not worth 10 *l.*, or if he is in a state of doubt upon the subject, he ought to send it to a jury?—I do not use the word coercion, but I think a man ought to be just as slow in admitting a man that is not entitled to the franchise as he should be in rejecting a man; that is, it strikes my judgment that a man who states that he pays 7 *l.* 16 *s.* for rent, states himself out of court, unless he proves also some powerful fact that would alter the case entirely.

2534. That is to say, that if you had been in Mr. Fogarty's situation, divesting yourself of all your partiality as an advocate upon the occasion, and working your imagination up to it, you would have rejected the man?—I think I would have rejected the man without working myself up to a very high pitch, and I assert that that was the principle acted upon by Mr. Fogarty's three predecessors in my presence.

2535. In your experience as a barrister, have you known many cases in which a counsel who has a decision against him, has entertained no doubt that if he had been the judge he would have decided otherwise?—No doubt of it; and I beg to state that my opinion as counsel, if I am to be understood as criticising Mr. Fogarty's judgment, ought to be received with the greatest possible distrust, because I do not like criticising the judgments of gentlemen that are placed in responsible situations.

2536. *Mr. French.*] You stated that you knew, at the election of Mr. M'Canoe, some cases of personification?—I heard of it. The way in which I heard of that was this: I was uninterested, for the gentleman for whom I was concerned was far at the head of the poll; but a solicitor in the town informed me, that afterwards, in looking through the list with a view of presenting a petition to the House, he found a number of persons who had handed about their certificates, and who had left their houses, had died, and some other persons had got the certificates, and by the 54th section of the Irish Reform Bill the production of the certificate is conclusive. I heard from some gentlemen upon the liberal side, that that occurred to as great an extent upon the side of Lord Arthur Chichester; but I can state, that all those persons are still upon the registry list, and there is no means of revising the list.

2537. You cannot state, of your own knowledge, any instance of personification?—No;

J. Whitehead, Esq.

21 March 1857.

—No; I can state this, as regards appealing to the assessor, to receive evidence against the vote, I had in the room the bailiffs that had put the man out of possession, and he very properly refused to receive the evidence; he had actually been put out of possession by the law, and yet he voted. There is no mode under the Irish Act for revising the register for eight years.

2538. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Do you recollect the case of a schoolmaster of the name of Clark, who was registered at Mr. Fogarty's first registry?—I cannot say that I do.

2539. Do you recollect the case of a man who came forward, and it appeared that he paid but 8*l.* rent; he stated his landlord paid him a compliment, and he was registered?—I do not recollect the case. Often when they have been asked, "How do you make out that your house is worth 10*l.* a year, when you pay but 7*l.* or 8*l.* rent?" The answer is, "Oh! he paid me a compliment."

2540. Do you recollect that this person alluded to, who was the first person admitted where the rent appeared to be under 10*l.* at this first register, was upon your side?—I do not recollect it. I beg to state, that I think that Mr. Fogarty applied the principle impartially; if that is the drift of the question, I will answer it at once, that I think he applied the principle with impartiality.

2541. Do you recollect that the very first instance in which he applied the principle was in the case of a conservative coming to register?—I do not recollect the circumstance; it may be so.

2542. These reports in the *Guardian* and the *Ulster Times* were all furnished by Mr. Bates?—I understood that there were two professional reporters.

2543. The *Guardian* and the *Ulster Times* are in the interest of the conservatives?—No doubt.

2544. *Mr. Hogg.*] Were the cases reported in the papers that are considered papers of liberal politics?—I believe they had no reporter.

2545. *Mr. Emerson Tenent.*] The report in the *Guardian* did not appear originally in that paper?—I believe it appeared in the *Chronicle*, which is a neutral paper in Belfast, a strange thing in Ireland; it is a paper that never has a leading article in it.

2546. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] In the former question your attention was called to the oath contained in the 10th of George the 4th, chapter 8; this form of oath, which Chief Justice Doherty prescribed, was peculiar to himself?—No one instance within my knowledge was any man rejected upon the ground of value, either by Mr. Fogarty or by the other barristers, which ever came before a jury, and therefore I cannot say what oath the judges would have applied.

2547. Have you ever heard that any judge followed the example of Chief Justice Doherty, and prescribed the oath that you have alluded to?—I have not.

2548. *Mr. Hogg.*] Have you ever heard that any judge deviated from it?—I have not.

2549. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Have you heard the rule laid down by Mr. Serjeant Green at the late assizes?—No; I know there was a difference of opinion about it, whether the judge had a right to apply that test, as no test is given in the Irish Bill; I do not see what better test he can apply than that.

2550. Will you look at the oath in the 7th schedule to the 10th of George the 4th; you will find there that it is applicable to the 10*l.* freehold franchise?—Yes; at the late assizes of Dundalk there was a borough case; a man had been rejected by Mr. Moore, upon the ground that his rent was about 8*l.* 8*s.* a year, and it came before a jury to be tried; the oath administered to the jury there, was, that they should well and truly try the value of the house. That was a case in a borough, and that case exactly illustrates the principle for which I always contended; because the valuers of the town there had rated the house at 11*l.* a year, but the attorney stated that the ground on which Mr. Moore proceeded, was, that wherever the rent was below the mark he rejected the claimant.

2551. Then in point of fact, Chief Justice Doherty's oath was not administered there?—If I recollect right, the oath of the jury was to try the value of the house; the abstract and intrinsic value of the house.

2552. *Mr. Emerson Tenent.*] Do you recollect any cases where claimants presented themselves, and a doubt having arisen, they were willing to be rejected in order to have it tried by a jury, and in which Mr. Fogarty refused?—I recollect no case of that sort upon the question of value; that was upon other questions; I recollect a case of occupation, the case of James Greer Bell.

2553. Are you aware of cases in which parties themselves were willing to consent

to a rejection in order to have the opinion of a jury upon the point, and in which Mr. Fogarty refused?—No, I am not aware of any such case in which they were willing to be rejected in order to have the opinion of a jury, but I remember that, in order to get the opinion of the court upon the lodger point, I offered to have the case rejected. Mr. Fogarty said that his own opinion being clear upon it, he did not see any reason to reject the claimant; but that was upon the question of occupation. The case in which the matter arose, which I suppose is now alluded to, was upon occupation; I proposed that some case should be rejected, to try the question upon the lodger point, which still remains undecided in Ireland, and that is whether an individual who reserves in his possession an actual occupation portion of the premises not of the value of 10 l. a year can be entitled to vote, because the only case which the judges decided was a case where, upon the facts, it appeared that the claimant had in his occupation premises to the value of 10 l. a year.

2554. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you apprehend that it was upon that ground that the judgment of the judges went?—I know that some of them afterwards took pains to say that it was upon that ground Baron Pennefather said that.

2555. Are you aware of any other judge who said that?—I think some of the others said the same thing.

2556. Are you aware that the judgment of the twelve judges did not proceed upon that ground?—I am far from saying what the judgment might be upon that point, but having heard that Baron Pennefather stated from the bench in a public way, that the only point they decided was, that where a party retained in his own possession and actual occupation premises to the value of 10 l. a year, he should be registered; therefore I inferred that the judges wished to exclude the idea that they had decided any other point, and that thenceforth the other point still remains for their decision, what they would do in the other case, where the party does not retain in his actual possession premises to the value of 10 l. a year; that other question upon the lodger point has not been decided; and I am far from saying that Mr. Fogarty is wrong in his view of it.

2557. Do you mean to say that Baron Pennefather undertook to state the opinions of the twelve judges, or only his own?—He spoke, as far as I understood from the report, as if it was the opinion of the twelve judges.

2558. Were you present?—I was not present, but my friend Mr. Molyneux was present, and he reported what was said.

2559. In what court was this?—In the Court of Exchequer.

2560. Then of course he was not stating the opinions of the twelve judges?—No.

2561. Do you mean to say that Baron Pennefather undertook to state any other opinions but his own?—According to the report it seems to me to speak the opinion of the Bench.

2562. Do you apprehend that Baron Pennefather, sitting in the Court of Exchequer, would profess to give the opinion of the twelve judges sitting in their chamber when they decided the question?—I cannot see why he should not state the opinions of the twelve judges as he was present, and I would receive with implicit deference the statement of any judge as to what passed in their chamber.

2563. Mr. Emerson Tement.] Will you state what the principle of occupation was which was acted upon in the times of Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry, and Mr. Mayne?—It was a very short principle, simply that the man should have been in his dwelling-house for the six months, actually occupying it for six months, inasmuch that the mode of examination generally occurred in this way:—"When did you take the house?" He would say that he took it at the 20th of April. "When did you go into possession?"—I went into it the last day of April." "Are you sure you did?"—Yes, I slept there that night." Then he was entitled to be registered upon the first of November following, because that would be six months' actual occupation. If it appeared that he had not, by himself or his servant or his family, been in actual occupation, he was rejected.

2564. Can you state in what the principles acted upon by Mr. Fogarty differed from those acted upon by the previous harristers?—The principle was this: that possession went a great way to satisfy the meaning of the words "actual occupation," and that if the party had legal possession and paid rent for the six months, and went into the actual occupation for any time before he appeared at the registration, he would be entitled to be registered.

2565. Are you aware of many persons who have been admitted on the registry under

J. Whiteide, Esq.

31 March 1837.

under such circumstances as you have now stated?—There are several; I cannot state the number.

2566. Are you aware that upon the question of occupation, an appeal has been had to the judges, and that the Chief Baron has decided contrary to the principle laid down by Mr. Fogarty?—I have heard so at the present assizes. Mr. Fogarty declined to give a case for rejection, but subsequently, in pursuance of my request, he did allow it to be rejected for trial, and the case of James Groer Bell contained the whole principle. It appeared to me that the occupation of a dwelling-house can only be by actual residence, and that if we depart from it for a week, we may in principle depart from it for the whole six months, and then there is an end of the proviso in the statute, which it appeared to me was intended to guard against occasionality, which is not guarded against by merely requiring legal possession, because a man may live in any part of the world, and have legal possession of the house.

2567. Mr. Serjeant *Bail*.] Were you at the last Dundalk assizes?—I was.

2568. Do you recollect being present when a case was decided by the Chief Baron upon appeal, where this question arose, namely, whether there was any actual occupation, in the sense in which you understand it, if a workman, a painter, for example, was sent in to repair the place for the resident; and do you recollect that the Chief Baron decided that that amounted to actual occupation?—I was present at that, and I will state what occurred. The registering barrister of that county, Mr. Moore, a gentleman of the highest character and standing, a king's counsel, rejected that vote upon the ground that the man was not in actual occupation. Then this man appealed. There was no counsel on either side. The attorneys stated the point, and it did not appear whether the person in question was a domestic servant or a workman. At first the Chief Baron was disposed to admit the vote. Then the attorney applied to have a counsel hearing, that there was a principle involved in it. I came off that night, but I have got a letter from a brother barrister, who says that the Chief Baron directed the facts to be agreed upon by the attorneys on each side, and he stated that if, when he looked into the case, it should appear that the man was a workman, and not a domestic servant, he would reject the vote in question. That has been discovered since, and that case has been rejected. The Lord Chief Baron thought the case too clear to require my friend to speak to it. Mr. Napier's letter informs me that "He said that occupation was to be taken with reference to the subject-matter to be occupied; that the words of the oath were, 'possession and actual occupation,' and that a house could only be actually occupied by the claimant using it as a dwelling-house; that he was inclined to say, that if any member of the claimant's household resided in the house, that would be sufficient; but if it were a workman, it clearly would not do. Hutton then said, that he thought the decision in the Dundalk case was in his favor. The Chief Baron said that in that case, when it first came before him, it was stated by the attorney for the claimant, that the house was occupied by a domestic servant of the claimant, and that was not denied by the opposite attorney; but that afterwards it had been ascertained, or at least alleged, that in point of fact the person in occupation was not a domestic servant, but a workman, and that the case stood over to have that fact ascertained; that the claimant not appearing to establish the fact, he suspended his decision till the fact should be established."

2569. Mr. *Hogg*.] Is there a note sent by the revising barrister of the facts of the case to the judge who is to hear the appeal?—The only judgment which the barrister would state in his book would be, "Rejected; not in occupation;" and in that way he would leave it.

2570. He would say nothing showing the judge the state of facts upon which he founded that opinion?—No, I think not.

2571. Mr. Serjeant *Bail*.] Did you say that the Chief Baron held that actual residence is necessary?—No, but that "actual residence" means residence either by yourself, by your family, or your domestic servants.

2572. Do you mean to say that the Chief Baron has held that?—That is my understanding of it.

2573. Do you recollect this, that Mr. Fogarty laid it down, that wherever there was not actual occupation in your sense, that is to say residence, he would require that possession should have been taken, and that workmen should have been actually employed upon the premises?—I admit that he decided that, but I do not recollect his laying down that principle. He unquestionably decided that a man should have legal possession and have the key, and possibly have workmen in preparing it for occupation.

2574. Did

2574. Did not he also require that at the time when the applicant came to register, he should be actually resident?—Undoubtedly, for some portion of the time; but I must observe, that if you dispense with any portion of the time, I do not know where the line is to be drawn. If I found in the statute any words saying that intent to occupy was sufficient, then I would admit that Mr. Fogarty was right; but the statute having enseted that it is to be actual occupation for six months, it strikes my judgment that if we depart from the actual occupation for one month, you may for six; and if you dispense with the occupation, why not with the possession, for they are both in the Act of Parliament; and in the same way with anything else contained in the statute.

2575. You are very familiar with all the arguments and the reasoning upon the subject; you have acted as counsel in many instances, and you have a very strong impression that your own opinion is right?—My own opinion I have already stated; that, as opposed to Mr. Fogarty's opinion, my opinion is of no weight, but fortified as it is by the decisions of the predecessors of Mr. Fogarty, of the same rank in the profession, and by the authorities to which I have referred, that opinion, in my humble judgment, cannot be impeached.

2576. Do you mean to say that the predecessors of Mr. Fogarty actually had this question to decide?—I mean to state that they decided as I have stated; but no such question as this was ever mooted by the counsel upon either side; they never attempted to make out that when the party had not gone into occupation by himself or his family or domestics, he could register out of the house. We agreed upon that point upon both sides.

2577. Mr. E. Tennent.] Did you cite to Mr. Fogarty the decisions of the judges which you have read to the Committee?—Upon that occasion I did, and Mr. Fogarty said that he would be obliged to act upon his own opinion; but that if a party came up to consent to be rejected, he would consent to his rejection. Then I had nobody on my side at that session; but I had, at the session after that, one that consented to be rejected, and then we got the question before the judge.

2578. Do you remember any case in which Mr. Fogarty stated that intention to occupy would satisfy that portion of the statute which required actual occupation?—No, he never said that intention to occupy for six months would answer, but that there should have been the original intention to occupy, and that he should have legal possession, and have been actually resident for some time.

2579. Mr. Serjeant Bull.] Mr. Fogarty did not consider that residence was the only test of actual occupation of a house?—No; he considered that possession and occupation were pretty much the same thing.

2580. But in the cases which he decided, the workmen had been actually employed for six months before?—That occurred in some cases, but I do not know whether it did in all. In one case the workmen were sent in by the landlord, and I submitted that the workmen being sent in by the landlord, put it out of the power of the barrister to conceive that to be occupation by the claimant.

2581. The predecessors of Mr. Fogarty decided this question according to your view?—They did.

2582. But in point of fact the question never was raised before Mr. Fogarty's time?—The counsel on the other side, Mr. M'Donnell, a gentleman of great experience, having been 20 years at the bar, and Mr. Nelson; neither of those gentlemen ever attempted to argue that a man, by having the legal possession of a house, could be said to be the legal occupier of the house.

2583. Then, in point of fact, the question was never raised before any of the predecessors of Mr. Fogarty?—It was not, because all parties appeared to agree that you are to make out that the party claiming the franchise went into the house by himself or his family, and sent in his furniture six months before the day at which he appeared to be registered.

2584. Of course then the predecessors of Mr. Fogarty never were called upon to decide that question?—They decided in this way. The first question that Mr. O'Dwyer would ask would be this: "When did you go into occupation? when did you go in to sleep?" and he dated the time from that date.

2585. But this question was never mooted before the predecessors of Mr. Fogarty?—It never was mooted that the intent to occupy was a sufficient compliance with the Act.

2586. Mr. Emerson Tennent.] Do you recollect the case of Thomas Smith, registered in January 1836?—I do not.

2587. It appeared that he put his furniture into the house between the 14th and

J. Whiteside, Esq.

21 March 1837.

20th of August, and he was registered in the January following, having just six weeks' short occupation?—That just exemplifies the principle.

2588. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Do you recollect whether he had not workmen in before?—I do not.

2589. Mr. *Emerson Tennent.*] Do you recollect any cases of permissive occupation which came up to be registered before Mr. O'Dwyer, Mr. Curry, and Mr. Mayne?—Several.

2590. What was the principle laid down by them in those cases?—They were all rejected by Mr. O'Dwyer. I think he rejected some schoolmaster who had a provision made for the teaching of a school. But I remember many cases that we argued before him which were all rejected.

2591. Do you remember a similar case being argued before Mr. Fogarty?—I remember the case of a person named Kane; he was the foreman of a public bakery managed by a committee, and they had a house attached to their bakery. The facts are already before the Committee. The decision was made upon the facts.

2592. Without going into the details of the case, can you conceive evils likely to arise in forming the constituency of a great manufacturing town, if the principle of permissive occupation were to be extensively acted upon?—As to that case I only go upon hearsay. It is quite enough for me as a lawyer to know that it is against the letter of the law, and that it was so is quite indisputable. It is now decided by the judges.

2593. You have stated that you conceive rent to be the best criterion of value; do you conceive that that rule would apply with greater force to houses of a higher value, or a lower?—With much greater force to houses of a lower value, and it is of much more practical importance with regard to them, because as to houses of a high value, it is not material to us whether a gentleman pays 30 *l.*, 40 *l.* or 50 *l.*; but when it comes to a 10 *l.* house, a discussion arises, and there it appears to me that it is the best possible rule to act upon; the rent paid by the man, particularly at a recent date, is the best criterion of value, except the rent be paid weekly; then I conceive it is not a criterion of value: for instance, I conceive four shillings a week no criterion that the house is worth 10 *l.* a year, because that has been so decided in the Poor Law of England, in the case of "*The King against the Inhabitants of Hellinglee*," where the question was, whether a pauper was entitled to a settlement as the occupier of a house of the clear yearly value of 10 *l.*, and the point was, that he paid four shillings a week. Now the Court of King's Bench held that 52 successive collections of four shillings a week did not prove the house to be worth 10 *l.* a year.

2594. What view did Mr. O'Dwyer take of that question?—He insisted that a weekly tenant should pay a considerably higher rent by the week: then he would require of a man that paid his rent by the year. I conceive these 10 *l.* houses to be pretty much about the same kind.

2595. Do you recollect the case of Arthur Hawill, who was registered at the first sessions when Mr. Fogarty officiated at Belfast. The house was situated in Hercules-street, the rent was eight guineas a year, and he paid 12 *l.* fine. The barrister said that the 10 *l.* per annum was not exclusive of taxes, and that the taxes might be included as part of the value. Do you recollect that case occurring?—Yes.

2596. Do you subscribe to the principle laid down by the barrister in that, in the case of adding taxes in making up the value of the house?—Certainly not; I conceive the question is, what is the abstract value of the house intrinsically, and that a fluctuating and uncertain payment of a certain tax for water or for sweeping the streets, cannot affect the question as to the value of the house. I admit that is useful, as it has been often applied by Mr. Fogarty as a criterion to judge of what the value of the house may be; but I cannot conceive how the taxes are to be included in the rent in estimating the value of the house; but that has been decided very frequently by Mr. Fogarty.

2597. Mr. *M. J. O'Connell.*] Do you know any instance in this country upon this subject, with regard to the law of settlement?—No; but I know that it was decided in the celebrated Bedfordshire case by the Committee of the House of Commons, where the voter was a freeholder and wished to make it up to 40 *l.* per annum by the taxes, and the Committee decided that it was impossible.

2598. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Supposing you were about to take a house in Belfast, and you understood that it was to pay no taxes, would not you be inclined to pay a higher rent in consequence?—That may be.

2599. Then is not the fact of a house paying taxes and the amount of the taxes

an ingredient to be taken into account in estimating the value?—I cannot conceive that it is to be included in estimating the abstract value of the house.

2600. Supposing you were going to take a house and you ascertained that it was to pay 2*l.* in taxes, and suppose that you ascertained that the house was worth 10*l.* Finding that it was to pay 2*l.* in taxes, you would say, I will pay only 8*l.* rent for it, because, as I have to pay 2*l.* in taxes, as the house is worth only 10*l.*, I will pay only 8*l.* rent?—I would make the best bargain I could.

2601. If you ascertain the house is worth only 10*l.*, finding that it was to pay 2*l.* in taxes, would not you deduct the 2*l.* from the 10*l.*, which you would otherwise agree to pay in rent?—I have taken several houses and I did not consider it in that way. I considered the value of the house as a residence. Every man knows that he must pay a portion of the local taxes incident to a house, and those taxes fluctuate in Belfast as they do in every other town; and although the amount of the tax is a natural inquiry for every man to make, he does not include it in the value of the house.

2602. Is not this a natural conclusion, that a man says, 'This house is worth 10*l.* a year, but there are taxes upon it to the amount of 2*l.*, therefore I will only pay 8*l.* a year rent?'—That may be a natural conclusion.

2603. Then is it not a just way, in estimating the value of a house, to take into account the taxes paid, and to add them to the rent?—I think not; I never heard it before, till that occasion, when it was done by Mr. Fogarty. He may be right; but all I can say is, that it was not mooted by counsel; and though it may, popularly speaking, be included in that way in the rent, yet as the law requires you to ascertain the clear yearly value of the house, it appears to me that it must be the intrinsic value of the house, and that it would be a strange result if it happened that a house worth 4*l.* a year, which was this year subject to five or six pounds local taxes, was by that means to be transferred into a house worth 10*l.* a year, and then was to be changed back again when the tax happened to be taken off.

2604. Suppose the landlord says to the tenant, 'I, the landlord, will pay the local taxes; they amount to 2*l.* a year; what rent will you pay me?' The tenant says, 'I will pay you 10*l.* a year; but if you do not pay the local taxes, I will pay you but 8*l.*' Is not that a natural course for things to take?—If a man can make that bargain, it is an excellent bargain, and that house is worth 8*l.* a year.

2605. The case that is put is of a house worth 10*l.* a year, and the landlord says, 'I will pay the local taxes, and you will pay me 10*l.* a year rent, or do you take the local taxes upon yourself and pay me 8*l.*' Would it not come to the same thing to the tenant?—Inasmuch as eight and two make ten, I suppose it would.

2606. Is not that the identical case that came before Mr. Fogarty, where he added the rent and the taxes together, and said, 'I will get at the value of the house from the addition of the two?'—It appears to me a totally different case. In the one case, you put it as a mere matter of arrangement between the landlord and the tenant; but the inquiry for Mr. Fogarty is an inquiry that the judge is bound to make, in reference to the Act of Parliament, out of which he is not to travel. He is directed to ascertain that the house is of the clear yearly value of 10*l.*, and that is to be tried by what that house will bring in the market; and it does not appear to me that the circumstance of that house being subject to a burden for another purpose can affect the abstract value of the house.

2607. Mr. *Everson Tenant.*] What taxes are those which have been added in this instance in Belfast?—The police tax.

2608. For what is that paid?—For lighting, cleansing, paving and watching the streets.

2609. That is, to give the occupant ease in the enjoyment of his house?—Certainly.

2610. Then you conceive that to have nothing to do with the value of the house itself?—I cannot comprehend it.

2611. Upon the same principle, would you conceive that the internal lighting of his house, or the internal warming of his house, or the internal painting of his house, was to be added to the value of the house itself?—I certainly would not.

2612. Is not the water tax equally liable to be added to the rent as the police tax?—It is.

2613. Could that by any possibility be construed as adding to the value of the house?—It could not.

J. H. Macaulay, Esq.

21 March 1837.

2614. *Chairman.*] There are no assessed taxes levied in Ireland?—There are none.

2615. But there are assessed taxes levied in England?—There are.

2616. Have not the assessed taxes to your knowledge been modified lately?—I have heard that they have.

2617. Are you aware of any decision in which it has been held, that houses which before paid larger assessed taxes, continuing at the same positive value, being registered as 10 *l.* houses, were not to continue to be so registered, because the assessed taxes are less?—I am not aware of any such decision.

2618. Would not the diminution of the assessed taxes in England have had the effect, if the principle were just, of reducing the number of voters in every borough in England?—Certainly it must diminish the value of the house.

2619. Then if Parliament proposed to completely relieve England from the assessed taxes, as it has relieved Ireland, the number of voters in every borough would be liable to be still more diminished by the operation of that act?—It would appear to be so upon that principle.

2620. *Mr. E. Tassent.*] Can you draw a very distinct line of difference between assessed taxes in England which are assessed upon the value of the house, and the taxes in Ireland, which are assessed for a totally different purpose, the amount payable by the individual being ascertained by the description of house in which he lives?—I do not see any difference; I think the same principle applies in each case.

2621. Are you aware to what fund the assessed taxes in England are carried?—To the Treasury.

2622. Has the individual any benefit from those taxes?—The same benefit that all the subjects of the realm possess.

2623. Do you see any distinction between the assessed taxes in England and the taxes in Belfast, which are paid for a direct benefit?—There is the distinction that the taxes in Belfast are paid for personal comforts.

2624. *Mr. Hogg.*] You are understood to state, that in your opinion, in estimating the value of a house under the Reform Bill, you are not to take into consideration any taxes paid?—That is my opinion, but that you may take it into the account as an ingredient in judging whether it is of the value of 10 *l.*

2625. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Your attention is called to the case of *The King against St. Paul, Deptford*, in 13 *East*, page 320. The note of the case is this:—"Settling for 40 days on a tenement, at the yearly rent of 10 *l.*, the landlord paying rates and taxes, will confer a settlement upon the tenant." That is the principle taken from the facts stated. Now the facts are these: "The Court of Quarter Sessions were of opinion, that if the taxes, rates, and charges usually deducted tenant's taxes, are to be deducted from the 10 *l.* which the tenant agreed to pay the landlord, the said tenement was not of the value of 10 *l.*; but if those taxes are not to be deducted, the said tenement was of the value of 10 *l.*" Then it came before the Court of King's Bench, and is reported in 13 *East*, and their decision is stated to have been this. Upon the authority of the *King against Framlingham*, in *Burrows' Settlement Cases*, 748, it was held unanimously by the Court of King's Bench, that the taxes should not be deducted. Therefore the result of that decision is this: that in estimating the value of 10 *l.*, the amount of rates and taxes paid is to be taken into the account. Now if that be law, can you distinguish it from the case you are now considering?—I certainly never saw the case to which my attention is called, but I hold my original opinion, that the words of this Act of Parliament being, that the harrister is to ascertain the clear yearly value of the house, it is impossible to include the taxes in estimating that value. The letter of Lord Stanley, which I have seen, appears to me to contain that view of the subject, because "the intrinsic value of the house" are the words he uses, and I think every species of absurdity follows from including the taxes in estimating the value of the house.

2626-7. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Does not it occur to you that taxes may be a measure of the intrinsic value, though not an ingredient?—I have said already, that it is a fair mode of ascertaining whether the house will produce 10 *l.* a year.

2628. May it not be an ingredient in the beneficial value, though not an ingredient in the absolute value?—Certainly.

2629. *Mr. M. J. O'Connell.*] Suppose the case of two houses perfectly similar in two different towns, in which the value of houses is generally the same; suppose however that the rates in town A should be only sixpence in the pound,

and the rates in town B one shilling in the pound, the consequence would be, that in town A one half of the sum would be paid in taxes for a house that is paid in town B. Do you consider the intrinsic value of those houses to be affected by the difference of the taxes?—I think not.

2630. Then supposing the rent in town A to be 9*l.* 15*s.*, and the rent in town B to be 9*l.* 10*s.*, the taxes being 10*s.* in the one case, and 5*s.* in the other, would you consider those two parties to be equally entitled to the franchise?—I would conceive that the taxes ought not to be included to make up the value of the house in the case put, and for this reason: it appears to me that houses are built altogether without reference to the question of what taxes may be put upon them, and that rents are asked for houses without any reference to that question. In Belfast I know rows of houses built where the rent is fixed by reference to the state of the market, at 12*l.* a year, and no reference is made whatever to the tax, which varies in every year; and in some streets there is no tax at all, and still the scale by which you ascertain the value of the house appears to be the same in all parts of the town, namely, what rent would be given for it in the market.

2631. Mr. E. Tennent.] Have you been connected with property of that kind in Belfast?—Simply in this way: I was trustee to a relative, a man who died, who had some houses. There was a row of 12 *l.* houses which were exactly alike in all respects; they were let directly, and afterwards the four large houses were set.

2632. Do you infer that there is a greater demand for houses of that class in Belfast than for houses of a better description?—I have heard it in all quarters. Belfast is a hive of industry. People begin by taking a small house, and according as they get up in the world, they take a larger and a larger house, and those who build houses, find it advantageous to build 10 *l.* and 12 *l.* houses.

2633. And that establishes your previous opinion as to the rent in Belfast, particularly for these small houses, being the best criterion of the value?—Yes; the houses I have spoken of appeared to be of precisely the same description, and I inferred from that circumstance, that persons who build houses of that kind, find it advantageous to build them of the same class, and description, and character, and there is not much variance in their internal fittings up.

2634. Mr. M. J. O'Connell.] You were understood to state that the difference of taxation in the hypothetical case which was put to you does not affect the intrinsic value of the houses; would it not affect the rent of those houses?—I do not know that.

2635. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Will a house that pays no taxes yield only the same rent as a house precisely the same in every other particular which pays taxes?—I will not say that; but there are parts of Belfast which do not pay taxes, but it appears to me that they pay the same rent.

2636. Take a dozen houses of the kind that is spoken of, half of which pay taxes and the other half pay no taxes; do you mean to say that the part which pays taxes would yield the same rent as that which paid none?—No; but I mean to say that that is a burden which every man in the state knows he is liable to, and that the question of rent has nothing to do with it; but if any case can be cited from the registration system in Ireland deciding the reverse, I will give up my opinion.

2637. You say that taxes have nothing to do with the rent of a house; now suppose you have 12 houses all in a row, and all precisely the same, and which, supposing them in every respect to be the same, would yield the same rent. Suppose that one half of those houses paid no taxes at all, and that the other half paid 2 *l.* or 3 *l.* a year taxes, do you mean to say that the six houses that paid 2 *l.* or 3 *l.* a year taxes would yield as good a rent as the other six that paid no tax?—I think they would not, certainly.

2638. Then does not it result from that, that the taxes do affect the rent?—They may affect the rent.

2639. And in the case put they would affect the rent?—Yes, if such a case could be found.

2640. Chairman.] In your judgment, do they affect the clear yearly value?—They do not.

2641. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But they do affect the rent?—They may affect the rent.

2642. And in the case just put they would affect the rent?—In the case just put of twelve houses in the same situation, with taxes upon the one six and no taxes upon the other six, it would be so, but it is a most unlikely case.

2643. Suppose you were the landlord of those twelve houses, and you thought proper

J. Whiteside, Esq.
21 March 1837.

proper to take upon yourself the payment of taxes upon six of them and to leave the taxes upon the other six to the tenant, would not the rent which you would receive for the houses the taxes of which you paid, be greater than the rent which you would receive for the others?—Of course, that is another way of putting the same question.

2644. And in that way the taxes would affect the rent?—Yes, and the inquiry in that case should be, “Does the landlord pay the taxes for you?” Then “What rent do you pay?” If he says “Seven or eight pounds a year,” then the barrister should say, “I do not believe this house is worth 10 *l.* a year.”

2645. Mr. *Emerson Tenant.*] From the general view which you have given to the Committee of what you conceive to be an erroneous practice in the administration of the Reform Act, will you point out the evils which you conceive resulting to the constituency from such practice?—The evils I should say are manifest. In the first place, there is no mode of correcting the list of the voters. At this present moment, although there must necessarily be a large number of persons improperly admitted and having no claim to the franchise, there is no mode of correcting the evil for the period of eight years; we cannot object to any voter appearing upon the list, and you cannot bring his claim by way of appeal under the notice of the bench. That is an evil that requires, in my humble judgment, immediate correction if the preamble of the Reform Bill is to be really carried into execution, namely, that the expenses of election should be diminished. It appears to me that there ought to be but one registration in each year instead of four, and that parties should be allowed to vote, as in England, immediately after registration; that any elector should have liberty to object to any man appearing upon the list for the time put as well as to any man claiming the franchise for the first time.

2646. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Do you think it would be advisable to open the registration altogether for revision, or merely to open those that have been brought forward since the registry?—I think the electors of a borough ought to have the privilege to object to any case appearing upon the list at the small hazard of costs, if the judge should conceive that it was brought forward without probable ground.

2647. And that with reference to previous matter as well as matter subsequent to the registration?—That would be my opinion. Of course there ought to be an appeal from that decision. Without that there never can be satisfaction in Ireland, and it would be most gratifying to the barrister himself that there should be that appeal. It appears to me further, that there should be, if possible, a standard of value, and that the best standard of value would be that used in the 10th of George the 4th, chapter 8, what a solvent and responsible tenant would pay.

2648. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] You would extend that to a borough?—I would; I think it appears more peculiarly applicable to a borough. It would also strike my humble judgment that there might be safely given to the assessor at a contested election, the power of asking the voter a question, but not going into any evidence. At present the production of the certificate concludes everything, no matter what injustice may be done by it; yet there is no mode of correcting that evil but by petition to the House of Commons; but if the assessor was permitted to ask a question or two of the voter, possibly that evil might be obviated.

2649. Would not that make it necessary to employ agents and counsel to a greater degree than at present?—I think not, because they are employed now, though they have very little to do. It also strikes me that the elections in the boroughs might be terminated in Ireland, as in England, in two days' polling, by compelling the assessor or the parties to provide a sufficient number of booths.

2650. *Chairman.*] You are aware that in England they do it in one day; do you consider it would be practicable, considering the strong excitement often prevailing in Ireland, to conclude an election with a large constituency in two days?—As far as Belfast is concerned, I think it would be perfectly possible and desirable; but as to the four registrations in the year, all parties agree in that being a crying evil.

2651. Mr. *Emerson Tenant.*] Would you alter the appointment of the registering barristers?—If these alterations were made, I think the present system of the registering barristers would answer very well. I should be very sorry to say anything about the creation of another tribunal.

2652. *Chairman.*] Do you consider that the connexion of the duty of registration with the administration of justice by the assistant barristers is injurious?—In some cases it may be, but I think if there was an appeal, and if those precautions were adopted, that feeling would in a great measure be done away. There is a
great

great evil in continual change, and there would be considerable inconvenience in appointing another tribunal, when the registering barristers are in many instances now acquainted with the principles upon which their brethren act; but nothing can be worse than the present system, because a gentleman may occasionally err in judgment, and there is no mode of correcting him if the error be committed in a case of admission, and I cannot understand why the evil of an improper admission is not as great as that of an improper rejection.

2653. Mr. Hamilton.] With regard to occupation, can you suggest anything to remove the ambiguity?—I think the oath ought to be as it is in England, because, in the oath of qualification, the premises are stated. The party swears that he is in the actual occupation of the same identical premises, and the premises are stated; whereas in Ireland the oath is in a vague general way, that his qualification still continues, and many a man, I believe, has taken the oath, and thought he might conscientiously take it, who had a *10 l.* qualification, though it is not the same qualification.

2654. So that as the words "actual occupation" are disputed, and have different meanings, the ambiguity would remain?—I never heard that the words are disputed, or had different meanings.

2655. You were understood to say, that some barristers have admitted permissive occupants and constructive occupants?—I consider it clear, that permissive occupants cannot vote; but it might be useful to have a declaratory enactment with respect to such things, and defining the word "occupation."

2656. Did not you say, that there were cases in which constructive occupants were admitted to register, persons who have not been in occupation for six months, except by their workmen?—Yes; and all doubt as to such cases might be removed, if necessary, by a declaratory law; but I conceive the present law is sufficiently clear upon that point.

2657. Would you think it desirable that that declaratory law should make actual residence by the individual himself, or by his servants, necessary in order to obtain the qualification?—I think the use of the house, or the warehouse, should be made the test; but, if there were an appeal to the bench, it strikes my mind that that would be the construction given to the words in the present statute. Unless this further power is given to parties, I do not know how you are to get at the truth; because, as the case stands at present, in Belfast, the valutors are out of the question; there are no valutors examined upon either side; they have been rather discredited. Then you have no power to summon any witness; you cannot subpoena the landlord; you cannot subpoena anybody; but if you find a person in court, willing to give evidence, you may bring him forward. It appears to me that that is a great mischief; that there ought to be a mode of subpoenaing the landlord, or whatever other person you might consider the best witness to testify as to the fact; and, in many instances, at present there must be a failure of justice in getting at the truth. Most landlords dislike to come forward to give testimony against their tenants in claiming the franchise, and other persons do not like to interfere, and you are driven to employ paid valutors, and then they are not considered satisfactory witnesses; so that the result is, that you depend upon chance or accident for a witness.

2658. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] What would you say to a system of transferring the assistant barristers from one county to another?—I think it would be a good rule to adopt.

2659. Would it occur to you that the adoption of a plan of that description would obviate some, if not most, of the objections that have been raised to allowing assistant barristers to register at all?—I think it would be an amendment in the law; but without an amendment of the law, in some respects, particularly upon the subject of appeal from admissions, you never will have satisfaction in the minds of the people.

Mercurii, 12^o die Aprilis, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Lord Granville Somerset.	Mr. Sergeant Ball.
Mr. Emerson Tennent.	Mr. Letroy.
Mr. Hamilton.	Mr. O'Connell.
Sir Robert Ferguson.	Mr. M. J. O'Connell.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Joseph Higgins, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Joseph Higgins.

12 April 1837.

2660. *Chairman.*] WHAT are you?—A seedsman and nurseryman.
2661. Where?—In Clonmel and in Dublin. I have got an establishment in Dublin; I have got nurseries in other places besides, near Lismore.
2662. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you live in the town of Clonmel?—I do.
2663. Did you hold any official appointment in Clonmel in the year 1828?—I was appointed as one of the three valuers under the commissioners appointed under 9 Geo. 4, for lighting and watching the corporate towns.
2664. Had you any system for that purpose in Clonmel before?—The town had been lighted before, and watched also.
2665. Was it under a private Act, or under a general Act, that Clonmel was lighted and watched before?—I suppose, a general Act; I believe, an Irish Act of Parliament relating to Ireland.
2666. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you know anything of any such Act?—I know that the town was lighted and watched before, and, I believe, under an Act of Parliament, not by private arrangement.
2667. Do you know of any such Act?—I do not know myself of any such Act, but I understood there was an Act.
2668. Mr. E. Tennent.] Then, on the passing of the 9 Geo. 4, the town was placed under its provisions?—Yes.
2669. You were appointed one of the valuers for the purpose of assessing the rates?—For the purpose of valuing the different houses in the town; there was then a scale by which the rates were to be assessed, I believe, in the Act of Parliament.
2670. Was your valuation made upon the improved rent, or was it an optional one?—The Act stated, on the full improved value of the premises.
2671. On the completion of your valuation, did it appear to give general satisfaction?—I believe it gave very general satisfaction, excepting a few cases; there were some few appeals from that valuation, on the ground of excessive value.
2672. What was the lowest class of houses, in point of value, that were admitted into that valuation?—Five pounds.
2673. You assessed no rate on houses under the value of 5 l.?—No.
2674. The town of Clonmel is still under the operation of that Act?—Yes.
2675. Has that valuation been altered subsequently, or does it continue in force?—I believe, in general, it is acted upon; houses have been altered and new houses have been built, and I suppose those have been added to the valuation, but in general it is acted upon; the houses generally are the same, I think, and the valuation is the same; there has been no re-valuation.
2676. How long did you continue valuator?—Only in the first instance, immediately upon the town consenting to come under that Act of Parliament.
2677. Then there is not an annual valuation?—I believe the commissioners remain in for three years, and there is no re-valuation during those three years. When the new commissioners come in, they may re-value, if they please.
2678. Mr. O'Connell.] But you are understood to say that you do not know of any re-valuation at all, a second valuation?—No second valuation.
2679. *Chairman.*] Have you been living in Clonmel ever since?—Yes.
2680. Could a re-valuation have taken place without your knowledge?—It could not; there could have been no general valuation without my knowing it.
2681. There

2681. There might be, as to particular houses, another valuation, but not generally?—Yes, and only in those cases where houses have been changed, and where new houses have been built.

2682. Mr. E. Tennent.] Are the commissioners now in office in Clonmel generally the same persons who were appointed originally?—No, they are not; the present commissioners are the third set of commissioners.

2683. In point of property and of rank, in the town of Clonmel, are they taken from the same class of persons that they were?—By no means.

2684. What description of persons were the first commissioners that were selected?—The most respectable for property in the town.

2685. What were the second set?—They were considerably inferior in point of property.

2686. In point of political feeling, is there any marked difference between those who are now in office and those who were in office at the time the original valuation was made?—I should think so; but I cannot say anything particular as to that.

2687. But the parties who are now in office have not changed the valuation which was adopted and approved of by the original commissioners?—No, they have not.

2688. So that both parties appear to have concurred in the propriety of that valuation?—The original valuation is generally acted upon. There has been no re-valuation since of the town.

2689. Do you remember the general election of 1832?—I do.

2690. And the registration which occurred previous to it?—Yes.

2691. Who was the registering barrister upon that occasion?—Mr. Guthrie.

2692. Do you know Mr. Guthrie personally?—I saw him upon that occasion; never before or since.

2693. Are you aware whether he is a member of the General Association?—I have seen his name as taking a part in the proceedings. I do not know anything about him myself.

2694. Chairman.] What do you mean by the General Association?—I mean what is called the General Association for Ireland, that has public meetings in Dublin.

2695. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you mean to say that that existed in 1832?—No, I do not.

2696. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you remember the registration which occurred at the close of the year 1832?—I do.

2697. Were you summoned as a witness upon that occasion?—I was.

2698. Have you any recollection how many notices were served of claimants to register?—I cannot say accurately from my own knowledge, but I heard there were 900 to 1,000. I understood there were a very great number, amounting probably to nearly 1,000.

2699. Mr. O'Connell.] Are there not persons who could tell us accurately?—I am not sure.

2700. Could not the Clerk of the Crown?—He is not here.

2701. But if he were here he could?—I suppose so.

2702. Mr. E. Tennent.] Have you any recollection how many persons were registered?—I should say about 500.

2703. Chairman.] But you cannot speak accurately?—Not accurately. I believe there is a book now here of the whole registry.

2704. Who has got possession of that?—One of the witnesses in waiting, of the name of Smith.

2705. Mr. E. Tennent.] By what party were you summoned as a valuator?—I do not know by what party; the summons was signed by the deputy clerk of the peace; the two other persons and myself who valued the town were summoned.

2706. Mr. O'Connell.] Who were the other two?—Mr. William Smith and Mr. Shee.

2707. What is Mr. Smith?—A corn-merchant.

2708. Is he alive?—He is.

2709. What is Mr. Shee?—An auctioneer and appraiser, and keeps a shop also.

2710. Is he alive?—He is.

2711. Mr. E. Tennent.] Did you attend the registering sessions in consequence?

—I did.

Mr. Joseph Haggate.
12 April 1837.

2712. How long?—I think, part of two days.

2713. How long did the sessions continue?—I believe, nine or ten days.

2714. How did it come that you attended only upon two days?—I gave evidence in one case, and I heard my name called out frequently in the progress of those two days, and I declined giving evidence. There was a very high state of excitement; and the barrister did not give credit to my evidence, nor did he receive the evidence of the other valuers, the persons who spoke as to the value of premises.

2715. Do you mean that he did not receive evidence sustaining the alleged value of the house, or evidence rebutting it?—I do not mean to say that he refused to receive evidence, but he gave a preference to the persons that came up to register, saying that they were the best judges of the value of their own premises.

2716. Do you mean to say, that, in instances in which a claimant came up to register, and in his own opinion alleged the value of his house to be 10*l.*, if evidence was given to prove that it was not worth 10*l.*, the barrister still registered that man upon his own assertion?—Yes, I say so. Even where the person claiming to register admitted that he did not pay 10*l.* for the place, nor anything like 10*l.*, he said it was worth to him 10*l.*; that was a very common expression, "It is worth 10*l.* to me."

2717. Mr. O'Connell.] Was not that person sworn?—He was.

2718. Then, when you talk of a person saying so and so, you mean that he said it upon oath?—Clearly; and when asked how it was worth to him 10*l.*, when he did not pay such a rent for it, he said, it was to him worth 10*l.* by letting out part of it to lodgers, or by the trade which he carried on in the place, shoemaking or tailoring, and in that way he made it out to be worth to him 10*l.*

2719. Then there was an investigation in each case?—There was in many cases.

2720. In any cases where objections were made?—There were in a great number of cases. There was Counsellor Welsh present to cross-examine, and that was one reason why it was not considered so necessary to give counter-evidence as to the value, because he was enabled to elicit by cross-examination all the facts with regard to the rent they paid that could have been proved in evidence.

2721. By whom was Counsellor Welsh employed?—I do not know.

2722. Did he belong to the popular party, or to the other party?—I should think he belonged to Mr. Bagwell's party.

2723. Mr. Bagwell was the former proprietor of the borough?—He was; at least his family. He was a young man just come of age.

2724. He bought it from the family of Lord Mountcashel?—The family of Lord Mountcashel and Lord Ormond.

2725. Mr. E. Tament.] Do you remember any declaration made by the barrister as to the intentions of the Legislature in the introduction of the Reform Act?—I do; I remember that he stated that his opinion was that it was the intention of the Legislature to extend the elective franchise to almost, if not altogether, to universal suffrage; that was his opinion, and that he would do so.

2726. Mr. O'Connell.] Mr. Dominic Ronayne was the person returned upon the first election?—He was.

2727. There was a petition against him upon the grounds of under-valuing?—Yes.

2728. That petition was tried?—It was.

2729. And the petition was not successful, for the Committee decided in favour of Mr. Ronayne?—They did.

2730. Were you summoned as a witness here?—I was.

2731. Were you examined?—I was.

2732. Mr. Lefroy.] Upon what ground did the Committee decide? Did they go into those objections?—No, they did not. I know the ground upon which the Election Committee refused to enter into the matter at all: they refused to receive any evidence that was not given before the registering barrister, and there was not a single scratch of a pen made at the time of the first registry; and the Committee refused to receive any evidence before them that was not given before the assistant barrister, and there was not a scratch of a pen, no writing whatever.

2733. Mr. O'Connell.] It was on the behalf of the petitioners that you were summoned?—I was.

2734. You belong to that party?—I cannot say that I am a political man.

2735. You do not belong to the other party?—No, I do not, indeed.

2736. An

2736. Are you a freeman?—No.

2737. They used not, in Mr. Bagwell's time, to make any freemen?—I believe there were a good many.

2738. Before the Reform Bill?—Yes, I think so.

2739. Do you know of any being made except when they got the borough transferred?—I am sure they made a good many.

2740. Mr. Hamilton.] You stated that you declined, at a subsequent period of the registration, to come forward as a witness, upon the ground that your evidence was not regarded?—Upon the ground that the barrister said, that the person was the best judge of his own premises.

2741. Can you state any particular instance in which you have given evidence with a view to establish the value?—There were many that I could have spoken to as not being of the value.

2742. Can you give the name of any individual with respect to whom you did give evidence?—Yes: I only gave evidence in one case, the case of Patrick Burke, No. 2, Dispensary-street.

2743. Were you in court at the time when he sustained his claim to register, during the whole period of the inquiry?—I proved that his place was not of 10 *l.* value.

2744. What was the course that was taken? Was he examined first?—He was.

2745. What was the evidence which he gave?—He swore it was worth to him 10 *l.*

2746. Was there a cross-examination of him by the barrister?—There was.

2747. Can you state the substance of that cross-examination?—He admitted in that cross-examination that he did not pay any such rent, but that, notwithstanding that, it was worth to him 10 *l.*

2748. Mr. E. Tennent.] What rent did he pay?—I think 4 *l.* a year.

2749. Did he bring any sustaining evidence, beyond his own assertion, as to the value of his house?—No.

2750. What was the amount of the evidence which you gave to the barrister?—I said that it was not of 10 *l.* value, and I said that the extreme value of the place was 8 *l.*; and, if the Committee will permit me, I will explain further that I fell into a mistake about the number of the house. This was called No. 2, Dispensary-street: I at the moment forgot, and thought No. 2 began at the opposite end, and I set a value upon the house, supposing it to be a house, the extreme value of which would have been 8 *l.*, and No. 2 happened to begin at the other end, where they could not be of any such value as 8 *l.*; and the man paid but 4 *l.*, and it is now, I think, at 3 *l.*

2751. Mr. O'Connell.] Patrick Burke does not live in it now?—No, he does not.

2752. Mr. Lefroy.] Was that house included in the valuation for paving and lighting?—It happened that that house was divided into two houses; the original house, No. 1 and No. 2, had been but one, and it was divided; when it was all one house, the whole of it was put under a valuation of 6 *l.*; and this was only a portion of the house.

2753. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you remember the case of James Gleeson?—I know his house very well.

2754. Was he registered in 1832?—He was.

2755. Do you remember what valuation you placed upon his house?—If valued at all, it could not have exceeded 5 *l.*

2756. Did it appear in the valuation under the 9 Geo. 4?—I doubt whether it did. I have not the books here, and I have no way of knowing that circumstance; but if it does appear, it does not exceed 5 *l.* in value; I know the rent is 5 *l.*, and I know it is not worth more. I have houses immediately in the neighbourhood.

2757. Do you remember the circumstances that occurred upon the occasion of his registration?—I cannot say exactly.

2758. Were you present at his registration?—I was not. I remained in court only two days.

2759. Chairman.] Does that man still reside in the same house?—He does.

2760. Mr. Lefroy.] Is he a voter?—He is.

2761. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you remember the case of Thomas Keiley?—I do.

2762. Where does he live?—In the same neighbourhood, within a short distance

Mr. Joseph Higgins.

10 April 1837.

distance of Gleeson: his house is a very small thatched cabin; my head would touch the top of the roof.

2763. Was he registered?—He was.

2764. What value do you suppose his house was?—Three to four pounds at the extreme value.

2765. Do you know anything of his landlord, or what rent he pays?—I believe he pays 2 l. 15 s. 5 d. a year.

2766. Did he pay the same rent when he was registered?—He did.

2767. Are you aware whether that fact was elicited in court or not?—I am not aware.

2768. Mr. O'Connell.] Were you in court when he was registered?—I cannot recollect that.

2769. Chairman.] Do you know that he is registered now?—I do.

2770. Mr. E. Teament.] Do you recollect the case of Nicholas Lynch?—Yes; he lives next door to Thomas Kelley; his house is of the same size and of the same value; he pays the same rent; it may be improved to the amount of 10 s. a year more by being kept cleaner.

2771. Chairman.] Have those houses any land joined with them?—They have a little bit of yard; I cannot call it a garden.

2772. Mr. E. Teament.] Do you mean to state that the value of 2 l. 15 s. or 3 l. a year for those houses takes in every accommodation connected with the houses?—I do.

2773. The whole value of their holdings?—The full value of their holdings; that is, the utmost they would let for, if they were to be let to-morrow, would be 5 s. or 10 s. a year more. They are let for what the landlord considers the value.

2774. Do you know Daniel English?—I do.

2775. Was he registered in 1832?—He was.

2776. Where does he live?—He lives in Upper Johnstone-street.

2777. What do you consider to be the value of his house?—Five pounds a year at the utmost; it is a very miserable thing.

2778. Are you aware whether he appears in the valuation book?—I do not think he does; I am almost certain he does not.

2779. Do you know the house of Richard Butler?—I do.

2780. Was he registered in 1832?—Yes.

2781. What is the value of his house?—Five pounds ten shillings is the rent he pays, and that, I think, is the value.

2782. Do you know Timothy Carey?—I do.

2783. Was he registered in 1832?—He was.

2784. Do you know his house?—I do, very well.

2785. Do you know what rent he pays?—Four pounds a year.

2786. What value do you conceive his house to be?—I should say that is worth 5 l.; that man has improved it a little by throwing up a little shed in the back yard, a thatched shed; and he has let the house to lodgers and that class of persons, and they go in through his hall-door into his little back yard, where this little shed is; and in that way, by letting off these places to lodgers, it is worth to him 10 l. a year probably, but it is not worth 10 l. to be let again.

2787. Is his house slated or thatched?—It is a small slated house, very small, and he has built a little shed against the wall; that he has covered with thatch, and he has admitted persons to occupy the shed.

2788. Do you know Martin Calaghan?—Martin Calaghan is dead; I knew his house, out of which he registered.

2789. Was that in 1832?—He registered in 1832.

2790. What was the value of that house?—Six pounds a year I would say is the present value.

2791. What was the value of it at the time of his registration?—Five pounds.

2792. Do you know William Davis?—I do.

2793. Where does he live?—Next door to Martin Calaghan.

2794. Was he registered in 1832?—He was.

2795. What was the value of his house?—Five or six pounds.

2796. Thomas Welsh?—Thomas Welsh? I know his place; he lives in New-street.

2797. That is the same street in which those other parties live?—The same street, but inferior to anything I have yet mentioned. It is not a house; it is a wretched thatched hovel that he keeps a forge in.

2798. What

2798. What would you suppose the value of it is?—Three pounds; nobody would give more. Mr. Joseph Higgins.
2799. Do you suppose that was the value when Welsh registered?—Yes. 12 April 1837.
2800. Had he any land or garden attached to it?—None.
2801. Martin Moroney; do you know him?—I do not know the man; I know his house.
2802. What do you suppose the value of that to be?—The same as William Davis's, 5*l.* or 6*l.*
2803. Was he registered in 1832?—Yes, he was on the registry.
2804. Do you know Thomas Sheehy?—Yes; he lives in Blind-street.
2805. Was he registered in 1832?—He was.
2806. What do you suppose to be the value of his house?—Five or six pounds. Such a house could not have appeared in the valuation book; it was a mere thatched cabin.
2807. Do you know John Hennesey?—He lives in Hopkins-lane. Several of those persons that I have named have not voted upon any particular side, they have voted for both sides; but I have determined not to make any distinction between parties. John Hennesey and several of the others have voted for both sides.
2808. What do you conceive the value of Hennesey's house to have been at the period of the registration?—Six pounds.
2809. John O'Flanagan?—He lives in White's-lane.
2810. Was he registered by Mr. Guthrie?—He was.
2811. Do you know his house?—I do.
2812. What do you suppose the value to have been?—He does not occupy the house: the house is in the book valued at 5*l.* John Flanagan was at the time of the registering but a lodger, paying 14*d.* a week; he admitted so to myself, and his landlord told me, "Though he said to you that he pays 14*d.*, he pays but 1*d.*"
2813. Was his landlord registered out of the same house?—No; it is a small house, down a narrow lane. The whole house is valued in the commissioners' book at 5*l.*
2814. What rent did Flanagan admit that he paid for his lodging?—He told me that he paid 14*d.* a week. I will state the circumstances under which he mentioned that to me. When I received the summons to attend at the registry to give evidence as to the value of places, in the year 1832, there was one valuator who thought it would be proper again to look at those places from which persons had served notices of their intention to register; and we went into this lane. I met a person, and I asked, "Where does John Flanagan live?" John Flanagan and James Flanagan both had served notices to register. I asked, "Where does John Flanagan live?" He said, "He lives up-stairs in that house," pointing to the house. I said, "Where does James Flanagan live?" "I am James Flanagan," said he, "and I am brother to John; we both live together." I asked what rent he paid; he said they paid 14*d.* a week. One only was registered.
2815. Were you present in court during his registering?—I was.
2816. Do you remember whether those circumstances were stated in court?—The circumstance was elicited by cross-examination, that he paid but 14*d.* a week.
2817. So far as your recollection serves you, were there not many cases of persons that were lodgers registered by Mr. Guthrie?—I believe there were several.
2818. Mr. O'Connell.] Can you name one besides?—I can. I know one case in particular.
2819. Mr. E. Tennent.] Are you aware whether Mr. Guthrie made any objection to register persons being mere lodgers?—I cannot say; but I can mention instances of persons who registered who were lodgers.
2820. And that fact appearing to the registering harrister?—I should say that there was no fact connected with the thing which was not brought out by cross-examination.
2821. Do you know any particular instances?—I know an instance of one place where it is a good house; the value of that house may be 40*l.* a year. One person registered out of the cellar; the occupier of the house registered out of the shop, and what apartments he had; and another person, who lodged up-stairs, registered out of the upper part of the house.

Mr. Joseph Higgins.

10 April 1837.

2822. *Chairman.*] Where is that house situated?—That house is in Bagwell-street; the first house in Bagwell-street, just connected with Dublin-street.
2823. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Do you remember the names of the parties who registered out of that house?—Joseph Burke was the name of the lodger.
2824. What was the name of the person who owned the shop?—Prendergast, I think.
2825. Do you remember the name of the person who registered out of the cellar?—Owen Sullivan, I think. The names appear upon the registry-book.
2826. Do you know the house in which John O'Brien lives in Hopkins-lane?—I do.
2827. Is he the proprietor of that house?—I do not know exactly whether he rented the whole house. Two persons voted out of that house; a person of the name of Jacob Bardon, who paid but 10 *d.* or 1 *s.* a week, and John O'Brien, who had a very poor place.
2828. John O'Brien and Jacob Bardon lived in the same house?—They did.
2829. And were both registered out of the same house?—They were.
2830. And both voted?—I suppose they did.
2831. What was the value of the house?—I do not think it is valued on the commissioners' book. It could not exceed 5 *l.* in value, if valued at all.
2832. Do you remember any other case of lodgers?—No one strikes me at present.
2833. Do you recollect the case of William Gorman?—I do, a smith; he had a little forge in a little shed, that is down now, and the man is gone. The new Bank of Ireland is erected where that little place stood. He was registered out of a place that was valued in the commissioners' book at 5 *l.*
2834. *Chairman.*] That could not be let out in lodgings?—No, it was only a little forge.
2835. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Do you know Timothy Dooley?—I do not know the man; I know his house in Dispensary-street.
2836. Was he registered by Mr. Guthrie?—I believe so.
2837. Do you know the value of his house?—Seven or eight pounds is the value of his house; he pays about 7 *l.*
2838. What was the value of it at the time of the registration?—The same.
2839. Michael Russell; do you know his house?—That man is of the same class of persons. I know his house; I was in the house.
2840. What value is it?—Eight pounds is the extreme value.
2841. *Mr. Lefroy.*] You made the valuation of those houses upon oath?—Yes.
2842. Is the value you are now giving to the Committee, according to the value which you made upon oath with another view altogether?—Those houses differ scarcely anything. Perhaps the house might be put down in the commissioners' book at 6 *l.* or 7 *l.*; and I now say, the extreme value is 8 *l.* When I state the extreme value, I go a little beyond what is put down in the commissioners' book; but it differs very little.
2843. Patrick Burke, to whom you have alluded before, lives in Dispensary-street?—There are two Patrick Burkes; one lives in a better house than the other.
2844. The person that you alluded to, what number in Dispensary-street does he live in?—The first person I alluded to lived at No. 2.; but there are two Patrick Burkes in the same street.
2845. What number is the other?—I do not remember the number; probably about No. 12. I can tell by referring to a memorandum.
2846. *Mr. O'Connell.*] When did you make that memorandum?—Previous to my coming here. With regard to the present value, and with regard to the rent he pays, that I had from his landlord. This memorandum is partly made out of former memorandums which I have by me.
2847. Have you the former memorandums here?—I have at my lodgings.
2848. *Mr. E. Tennent.*] Will you refer to your memorandum, and state what number it is?—It is 12, Dispensary-street.
2849. *Chairman.*] From whom did you have the amount of the rent?—From the landlord, Mr. Joseph Grubb.
2850. What is the value of the house?—The rent he paid, the landlord told me, was 8 *l.* Irish, of which the tenant complained, and he had it reduced to 7 *l.*
2851. What is the value?—I should say that is the value.
2852. *Mr. Serjeant Bail.*] Is the landlord here?—No.

2853. *Mr.*

2855. Mr. O'Connell.] When did he tell you that?—A short time previous to my leaving Clontarf.
2854. Do you know Paul Winberry?—I do.
2855. Do you know his house?—Yes; it is 6, Catherine-street.
2856. What is the value of it?—Six or seven pounds a year at the outside.
2857. Was he registered in 1832?—Yes.
2858. John Coghlan, of Bocheens; do you know his house?—I do.
2859. What value is it of?—A very wretched thatched cabin, but there is about half an acre of land attached to it.
2860. What is the whole value of it?—I should value it at 6 l., the cabin and the land; it is an open piece, with no enclosure about it.
2861. Do you know the house of Thomas Hill, in Upper Johnson-street?—I do.
2862. What kind of street is it?—Part of it is good, and part bad; there are some respectable houses in it, but this is a very narrow part where he lives, and the houses are small; but he has got a little shop.
2863. What would you conceive the value of that house to be?—Eight pounds a year; that is the rent of his house.
2864. Do you know the house of Lawrence Cashin, in the same street?—I do.
2865. Was he registered in 1832?—No; I think he was registered since.
2866. What do you suppose the value of his house to be?—Seven or eight pounds.
2867. Who was he registered by?—I do not know; either Mr. Hobson or the present registering barrister, Mr. Howley; but we thought it was under value, and therefore we made a memorandum of that house.
2868. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you state that Lawrence Cashin was registered?—Not in 1832; but since that.
2869. When?—Since 1832 he appears upon the list of registered persons.
2870. You know it only by his appearing upon the list?—That is all.
2871. What do you conceive the value of his house to be?—Seven or eight pounds.
2872. Mr. E. Tennant.] Do you know William Brown of the same street?—I do.
2873. What description of house does he inhabit?—It is a thatched house, and he keeps a little shop.
2874. What value do you attach to it?—About 8 l.
2875. Do you know the rent?—I think that is the rent.
2876. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Who registered him?—I do not know. I have not selected them with reference to the time of registering.
2877. Mr. Hamilton.] You have already stated that you made the selection without reference to their opinions or to how they voted?—I have, certainly.
2878. Walter Bowles; do you know his house?—I do. I think he was registered since 1832.
2879. What rent does he pay?—Six pounds a year.
2880. What value do you attach to his house?—I think that about the value.
2881. Is it a thatched house?—It is; but there is a garden attached to it.
2882. Do you include that in the value of the premises?—Yes.
2883. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you know who registered Walter Bowles?—I do not.
2884. Who was the registering barrister in 1833?—Mr. Hobson, I think.
2885. Do you happen to know that it was in 1833 that Walter Bowles was registered?—I think it was.
2886. Did you ever hear that Mr. Hobson's politics are very liberal?—I heard that he was a very fair registering barrister; and I heard the same said of Mr. Howley.
2887. The question is with reference to the politics of Mr. Hobson?—I know nothing of his politics.
2888. Mr. Hamilton.] Jeremiah Meyers, Upper Johnson-street?—He lives next door to Walter Bowles; the house is the same description of house.
2889. Do you know the rent?—It is in better order and cleaner: I would say it is worth 7 l. a year.
2890. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you happen to know that he has built upon the premises?—Yes, he is a butcher, and there is a little building.
2891. Built

Mr. Joseph Higgins.

2891. Built by him?—Built by him.

2892. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Do you know the rent?—I should think the rent is about 6 l. a year, and I would say that 7 l. a year is about the value. I think, if the place were to be let to-morrow, it would not bring more.

2893. Have you any knowledge, either from the individuals themselves or from the landlords, of the rent of these houses?—I ascertained from many of the individuals themselves the rents they were paying.

2894. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Is it your opinion that a house is not worth to a man more than the rent he pays for it?—In some cases, a man letting lodgings, it might be worth to him more than the market value.

2895. That is to say, he might receive more?—Yes.

2896. Do you imagine that a man pays for a house the extreme value of it to him?—I rather think he does.

2897. That is your idea of the value?—That is my idea in general.

2898. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Are houses all let at a rack-rent?—Not at a rack-rent.

2899. What do you mean by a "rack-rent"?—A rack-rent is the extreme value.

2900. You were understood to say that it was the practice to let houses at the extreme value?—The practice is to get the full value for the premises, and I would call the rack-rent something beyond that.

2901. Something beyond the full value?—Something beyond the full marketable value.

2902. The practice is to let the houses at the full value, but not beyond the full value?—To let houses at the full value.

2903. So that the tenants have no interest whatever in the house?—I think, in general, in Clonmel the full value is paid for the premises.

2904. Then you draw the inference that the tenant has no interest whatever in the house?—Unless he can make an interest by other means besides.

2905. Besides what?—Besides the mere house; unless he can add a value to it from the business which he follows in the house, and if you add to that letting lodgings, he may derive an interest in that way; but I look upon that as distinct from the value of the house.

2906. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Do you think that the convenience of a shop, for example, which enables a man to earn money, does not add to the value of the house?—I say that the circumstance of the shop enables the landlord of the house to get the value for it.

2907. Then rent and value, in your opinion, are synonymous?—Certainly; rent and value, in my opinion, are synonymous. I speak with respect to Clonmel.

2908. *Mr. Hamilton.*] With reference to this description of house, or with reference to all houses in Clonmel?—With respect to all houses generally, it is well known that the rents in Clonmel are high, and that the full value is given and obtained for houses there.

2909. *Chairman.*] There may be particular circumstances which would alter your opinion; but you mean to say that the general practice at Clonmel is to get as great a rent for the house as they can, considering the solvency of the tenant?—Yes, that is my opinion.

2910. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Were those persons for the most part tenants at will, or do they hold under lease?—Generally yearly tenants, holding from year to year.

2911. Probably you do not know that fact of your own knowledge?—No.

2912. *Chairman.*] Mr. Grubb's tenants; do you know whether they are under lease?—Not under lease. I do not think there are any leases for such houses in Clonmel.

2913. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] What is the rent of Myers's house?—It is a similar house in all respects to Bowles's, and I should say the rent is 6 l. to 7 l.

2914. That is your conjecture?—Yes; I do not know exactly, but Bowles's house is the very next door, and it is in all respects a similar house.

2915. What is Bowles's rent?—Bowles told me his rent was 6 l. a year. I think Myers's is about the same.

2916. Would you be surprised to hear that he paid more than 7 l. rent?—I have mentioned that Myers's house was a more improved house, and that I would put 1 l. a year more upon it.

2917. Would you venture to put more than 1 l. a year more upon it?—Very little.

2918. Then

2918. Then you would not put more than 1 l. a year more upon Myers's house?—I would say there is a difference of 1 l. a year; hardly anything beyond.
2919. How much more?—£. 1 or 30 s.
2920. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you know the house of Michael Murphy, in the same street?—Yes; that is one of those houses that is inferior to Bowles's house, or Myers's; Myers's is the best of the three, and Murphy's is the worst.
2921. Is he registered?—Yes.
2922. Do you know when?—I believe, in 1832.
2923. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Are you sure of that?—No, I cannot speak to that.
2924. With respect to Bowles, do you know how he voted at the last contested election?—For Mr. Bagwell, I suppose, and many of those that I have mentioned as being under value voted for Mr. Bagwell.
2925. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you know the house of Edmund Day?—I do.
2926. It is in the same street?—It is.
2927. One of the same row?—Yes; it is a better house than Myers's, Bowles's or Murphy's.
2928. What value do you presume it to be of?—The man pays 8 l. 10 s. a year rent. There is a nice little garden attached to it; nothing in it, but a nice little piece of ground; and there is another man living next door to him.
2929. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you adhere to your former notion that Day's house is not worth more than you state it?—I merely state the rent he pays, which I think is about the value. I think that is the value of his house.
2930. Mr. O'Connell.] Then you adhere to your former notion that rent and value are the same?—I think that the house would not let for more.
2931. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you adhere to the notion that rent and value are synonymous in that instance?—I do.
2932. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you know John Bagg, in the same street?—I do.
2933. What is the value of his house?—Seven pounds, I should say.
2934. Is he registered?—Yes.
2935. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you mean that there also 7 l. is the rent?—I do not know what the rent of his place is, but I think that is about the value of his place.
2936. But you take for granted that the rent is 7 l.?—No; I do not always take it for granted that where the value is 7 l. or 8 l. the rent is precisely that. In some cases I draw distinctions between the rent and the value, where there are some little improvements made.
2937. Mr. O'Connell.] Then rent and value are not synonymous, as you have stated that they were?—If a person takes a house, and does not improve the house, the house is of no more value than what he pays; but if he improves the place, it is of more value.
2938. Have some of the Clonmel men improved their places?—Some have.
2939. Then, in those cases, rent and value are not synonymous?—Improvements have been made in some instances.
2940. Mr. Lefroy.] Have those improvements been made since the time of their being registered?—They have undergone several changes. I cannot speak exactly as to the extent of the improvements.
2941. Mr. O'Connell.] You consider those houses of more value than the rent, do not you?—Where improvements have been made, I do.
2942. Then, in those cases, it is manifest that rent and value are not synonymous?—In those cases where improvements have been made.
2943. Then you qualify your former answer, in which you said, that in Clonmel you considered rent and value as synonymous?—Not exclusive of improvements.
2944. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you know the house of James Gleeson, in Cashill-road?—I do.
2945. What is the value of that?—Six or seven pounds a year. That man has a range of cabins, and his own house, if let separately, would not let for more than 6 l. or 7 l. a year; but he has built a range of cabins, and the ground on which his house stands is the same as that on which these cabins stand, so that it is worth a little more in that way.
2946. Amongst those persons, are you aware whether there were any appeals against the valuation which was made in 1828?—I am not aware of any of those cases.
2947. Mr. O'Connell.] Can you state positively that you made a valuation, in

- Mr. Joseph Higgins. 1828, for each of the persons you have named?—Not at all; many of them were under the value of 5 *l*.
2948. Mr. E. Tennent.] Are you aware, whether, amongst those persons that have been mentioned, there is the name of any person who appealed, and has had his name taken out of the valuation altogether?—I think not in this list.
2949. Mr. Hamilton?—You stated that there were several of those houses of which you made no valuation, because they were under 5 *l*. Now at the time of the valuation, did you value all that you believed to be above 5 *l*?—We did.
2950. You exercised considerable diligence to ascertain what houses were above 5 *l*?—We did our utmost.
2951. Mr. Levey.] You were bound by oath to do so?—We were.
2952. Mr. Hamilton.] What means did you take to ascertain the value of the houses which you did value? Did you inspect the insides of the houses?—In many cases we did; we inquired the rent from the individuals, and in some cases from the landlords, and examined the premises outside, and in many cases went inside and examined.
2953. Did you find any indisposition on the part of the people to allow you to inspect their premises?—None.
2954. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] In many cases you did not go inside?—In some cases we did not go in, but in very many cases we did; and when I received a summons from this Committee, I went into some of the places on receiving that summons, to look at the thing again and obtain information, and the people showed an unwillingness to allow me to look at their places. I told them I had received a summons from this Committee, and as I might be called upon to speak as to the value, would they object to my looking at their places. In no instance was any objection made, except one man, that said "it is not convenient now." I told them the purpose for which I was doing it.
2955. It was in 1828 that you made this valuation?—Yes.
2956. Was it previous to 1828 or in 1828?—In 1828.
2957. That is nine years ago?—Yes.
2958. The condition of the premises is not much improved in the nine years?—Some have improved very much; there are alterations taking place, some improving and some declining.
2959. Mr. Hamilton.] At the time when you valued, in cases where improvements had been made before to that time, you took those improvements into account in your valuation?—Certainly; we valued according to the present improved value, without reference to the rents that were paid.
2960. And in giving this Committee the valuation, do you include those improvements?—I do.
2961. When you say the time of the registry, do you mean in the year 1831?—No, in 1832.
2962. Did you value again in 1832?—No; but I was called upon to speak as to the value.
2963. Chairman.] Generally speaking, do you mean to say, that the value of the houses in Cloumel, upon the whole, are about the same as they were formerly?—About the same.
2964. Varied by particular circumstances, but generally speaking, the same character of house bears the same value as it formerly did?—About the same that it did in 1828.
2965. Mr. O'Connell.] Each of the three assistant barristers have registered as 10 *l*. voters, houses that you considered not of that value?—I do say so; but Mr. Guthrie particularly, the first revising barrister.
2966. He registered more than the others?—No comparison.
2967. Mr. Hobson registered houses that you did not consider of 10 *l*. value?—I do not consider that they would let for 10 *l*.
2968. And therefore you do not consider them of 10 *l*. value?—Yes.
2969. Mr. Guthrie registered houses that you did not consider of 10 *l*. value?—Very few.
2970. But some?—I think there might be three or four cases in that list between the two revising barristers.
2971. Not more?—I should think not in that list.
2972. Mr. Hamilton.]—You stated that Mr. Guthrie registered houses which you consider under 10 *l*. value, on the evidence of the claimant himself, contrary to or without any other evidence?—Yes.

2973. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you know any other case but one?—Yes, there was other evidence given. Mr. Joseph Higgins.
2974. In your presence?—Yes. 12 April 1837.
2975. Mr. Hamilton.] Did Mr. Howley act upon that principle in any case?—I do not know, for I never have been called upon to attend any registry; I never volunteered then or now.
2976. You stated that the people in general then were satisfied with the manner in which Mr. Howley has conducted the registration?—They were perfectly, in every respect.
2977. Have you property yourself in Clonmel?—I have.
2978. Have you any houses on your property of the description of those houses which you have been advertising to?—Yes, some.
2979. Mr. O'Connell.] Mr. Howley is a Catholic?—He is.
2980. Mr. Hamilton.] You stated that the valuation which took place under the 9th Geo. 4. was a full and fair valuation?—It was.
2981. Did the people generally feel inclined to sanction rather a high, or at least not an under, valuation being made at that time?—That valuation was considered, upon the whole, the full improved value; in some cases some persons thought they were put too high. From the valuation there were some appeals.
2982. Mr. O'Connell.] Nobody appealed who thought he was put too low?—No.
2983. Chairman.] What is the outside amount of rate in the pound that can be levied upon a house valued 5 l.?—Sixpence, I think.
2984. For a house valued 10 l. and not exceeding 20 l.?—Eight-pence and 9 d., and 1 s. the highest class.
2985. Therefore it was a great object with parties to be kept under 10 l.?—It would have been for those concerned.
2986. On the other hand it would be for the valuers to take care that the houses of the value of 10 l. should not be valued at less?—That was the reason we took so high a scale, for we should have left out houses that were worth 5 l. if we had taken a low scale, and those persons then would not have borne any part of the public burthen. If we had valued a house worth 40 l. at but 30 l., then a house worth 5 l. would have been left out of the valuation altogether.
2987. Mr. Hamilton.] So that in taking a high valuation you lowered the amount of taxation?—We did, and equalized it.
2988. Mr. O'Connell.] You increased it upon the individual, but lowered it upon the entire?—I do not know that, because it has not been necessary to go to the full extent of 1 s. in the pound. In consequence of taking that high scale, 8 d. in the pound has done; and if the valuation had been lower, if my house had been 50 l. instead of 60 l., I should have had to pay 10 d. in the pound or 1 s. in the pound.
2989. Chairman.] But whatever might have been the amount paid by the highest class of houses, the class of 5 l. must be reduced proportionably?—Yes; there are three classes.
2990. The lowest class, in fact, must pay one-half of what the higher class pay, whatever that be?—Yes; some persons pay 20 l. and upwards.
2991. Mr. Hamilton.] You have stated a number of instances in which persons holding houses not worth 10 l. have sworn that they were worth 10 l.; of course you do not mean to say that those individuals swore that which they did not believe to be true?—I think those persons had no intention to perjure themselves; they take houses at low rents, and they let in a number of families or individuals to the houses, and they let them off, and crowd up the places, and then, including what the party occupies himself, they think it is worth 10 l.
2992. So that the abuse, if abuse it be, arises from the ambiguity of the law, not from the impropriety of individuals?—Yes. I have seen several cases in which several families have been residing in one room; I do not think the people intended to perjure themselves.
2993. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You say in many cases they let in families; all those families paid rent?—Yes.
2994. And in that way they made more than 10 l. a year?—They admit families in, and individuals in, perhaps two or three families in one room, those paying a shilling a week each, and that amounts to more than 10 l. a year.
2995. Mr. O'Connell.] And continuing to occupy part themselves, and setting a value upon that part?—Yes, in addition to the rent they receive.
2996. And

Mr. Joseph Higgins.

12 April 1837.

2996. And thus, in many of those instances, they gained more than 10*l.*—Yes; but if that place were to be let to-morrow it would not let for more than 3*l.* or 4*l.* perhaps.
2997. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Mr. Bagwell was not what is usually called a conservative in politics?—No.
2998. He is what is called usually a whig?—I think so.
2999. Mr. *O'Connell*.] He opposed Mr. Rosayne, the popular candidate?—They opposed him, I think.
3000. And successfully?—Yes.
3001. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] In point of fact, the conservatives supported him?—I suppose they did for the want of a better.
3002. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Did you vote yourself?—I did.
3003. For Mr. Bagwell?—My family are under obligations to Mr. Bagwell.
3004. Can you name any other of the persons you have mentioned who voted for Mr. Bagwell?—Yes; Walter Bowles, John Hennessy and Timothy Carty.
3005. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Do you know how Thomas Walsh voted?—For Mr. Bagwell.
3006. Do you know how William Davis voted?—For Mr. Bagwell.
3007. And he was registered by Mr. Guthrie?—He was.
3008. And so was Thomas Walsh?—Yes; sometimes they voted one way and sometimes another.
3009. At the last election?—At the last election Thomas Davis voted for Mr. Bagwell, as I understand.
3010. I believe every one of those were registered by Mr. Guthrie?—They were.
3011. Except Bowles; he was registered by Mr. Hobson in 1833?—I think he was.
3012. You have mentioned Thomas Hill; where does he live?—In Upper Johnson-street. Thomas Hill has a shop, a very small place. Thomas Hill is one of those cases that seems to me under the value.
3013. When you have been speaking of the value throughout this inquiry, you have had your mind intent upon the rent; that has been the standard of value in your mind?—Yes.
3014. Mr. *Lefroy*.] You do not mean to say that if the house was worth more than the rent, you would estimate it merely by the rent?—No; I would estimate it at its value. With respect to Hill's house, I think rent and value are synonymous there, because that house is not improved, and it would let for no more.
3015. Mr. *Hamilton*.] You have already stated that at the time you made the valuation under the 9th of Geo. 4, you made it without reference to rent?—Certainly, according to the present improved value.
3016. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] You mentioned Daniel English; what rent do you say that he pays?—I do not know.
3017. What value do you put upon the house?—Five pounds I would say is the outside value.
3018. Would you be surprised to find that he pays 10*l.* a year rent?—I would be greatly surprised.
3019. Supposing it were demonstrated that that man pays 10*l.* a year rent, would that lead you at all to mistrust your own judgment as to those other persons?—No.
3020. You would just feel as confident as ever?—Yes; I do not know his rent, but I know the house, and I should say, if it be the house in which he resides, it would not let for 10*l.*
3021. Have you been in the house?—I have.
3022. When?—A good while ago; and it is a little miserable thatched house. I pass by it very frequently.
3023. Of course you cannot tell what improvements have been made since you have been in?—Unless the improvements have been hidden from view; there has been no external improvement.
3024. If improvements have been made inside and hidden from view, perhaps you can account for its being worth 10*l.*?—It is a very poor looking house.
3025. Mr. *O'Connell*.] You spoke of Burke, Prendergast and Sullivan as registered out of one house; the cellar has a separate street-door or outlet?—It has.
3026. The house is a corner house?—It is.

3027. I presume

3027. I presume there are two doors to it, one in each street?—One is the hall-door in the street, the other the shop-door in the lane.

3028. There are three separate entrances to the house?—Yes; there is the cellar, the shop-door and the hall.

3029. Thus making three separate holdings out of one house?—Yes, you may call it so; there is the hall-door in the lane, the shop-door in front of the street, and the cellar-door.

3030. Burke used the door in the lane?—Prendergast's family must have had access through the hall-door.

3031. Was Burke the shopkeeper?—Burke was the lodger, Prendergast the shopkeeper.

3032. Dublin-street is one of the best streets in Clonmel?—It is a very narrow street, but a great thoroughfare. It is a good house; that house is worth, I suppose, 40 l. a year.

3033. The house, which you say is worth 40 l. a year, is a house out of which three persons have been registered?—Yes, the cellar, the shop and the lodgings; Prendergast was the occupier of the house, and Burke was the lodger.

3034. Mr. Hamilton.] Is the cellar worth 10 l. a year?—No; scarcely any cellar lets, I think, for 10 l. in Clonmel.

3035. Mr. O'Connell.] What business is carried on in those cellars?—In the cellars generally they sell salt meat and eggs and butter; what are called hucksters' shops.

3036. They must have bed-rooms besides the cellar?—Not bed-rooms, but they have frequently lodging beds in many of them; they crowd into a corner.

3037. Mr. Lefroy.] In the entire list of names that you have given, how many of the houses will come within the description which you gave of being wretched thatched houses or cabins?—They must all be inferior houses that are not worth 10 l. a year in Clonmel.

3038. Mr. O'Connell.] There is a great deal of business stirring in Clonmel?—Yes, it is a fine commercial town.

3039. Increasing in prosperity?—Yes, I hope so.

3040. Who are the present commissioners?—I do not recollect all their names.

3041. Is Luther one of them?—I dare say he was one of the first or second; but the present commissioners are of less importance than the second set.

3042. Is Bianconi one of them?—I cannot say; they are generally inferior men to those. I am not sure whether Mr. Luther is one or not; he is a most respectable gentleman.

3043. Chairman.] Is Mr. Hackett a commissioner?—Yes.

3044. Mr. Dennis Welsh?—I do not know.

3045. John Butler, a woollen-draper?—Yes.

3046. Stephen Lonergan, a solicitor?—No.

3047. Mr. Lefroy.] Can you say, of the entire number you have mentioned, how many come within this description of being miserable thatched cabins or houses?—By reference to the list I should be able to point out a great number which are thatched. I suppose there are about 15 or 16 of those which are thatched cabins, but they are not always the worst for being thatched; there are some of those which are slated, which are inferior to a few that are thatched.

3048. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Will you mention the names of those that are thatched?—There is Kelly's, in Gravel-walk; Nicholas Lynch, Gravel-walk; Daniel English, Upper Johnson-street; Thomas Walsh, New-street; Thomas Sheely, Blind-street; William Gorman, Bagwell-street, but that is down long ago, and the Bank of Ireland erected there; Walter Bowles's is a thatched house; Jeremiah Meyers's is a thatched house; Michael Murphy's is a thatched house; John Bagg's is a thatched house; James Gleeson's, in Cashill-road, is a thatched house.

3049. Mr. O'Connell.] But you say that several of those thatched houses are better than some slated houses?—Yes, some are worse, and some are better; for instance, such a house as William Brown's; he has a shop connected with it; that is better than some that I have named that are slated.

3050. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Where does John O'Brien live?—In Hopkins-lane.

3051. Mr. Lefroy.] Did you say that there were some of the slated houses that were inferior to any of the thatched houses?—No; the very worst description of

houses are a few of the thatched houses; then there are still some thatched houses better than some that are slated.

Mr. Joseph Higgins. 3052. Mr. O'Connell.] You have said also that Mr. Guthrie heard any evidence that was offered in opposition to the voter?—Yes; he did not refuse in any case.

3053. He laid more stress upon the evidence of the occupier himself?—He did, decidedly.

3054. But he still heard any evidence that was offered without interruption?—He did not offer any interruption to any person that was disposed to give evidence in opposition; but the objection was, that he did not regard the evidence. He said the person was the best judge of the value of his own premises; and when he swore it was worth to him so much, he then registered, saying, "they were the best judges of the value of their own premises."

3055. And he occasionally heard evidence besides the man himself in support of the value, if he found it necessary?—It was not necessary to give any such evidence, because Counsellor Walsh, by the cross-examination, was enabled to elicit from the persons that came to register the exact rent which they paid, and so in the manner in which they made it worth 10 *l*.

3056. So that, in point of fact, those persons upon their cross-examination stated the facts precisely as the adverse witnesses could have sworn them?—Yes, they admitted everything that could have been proved in evidence as to the value of their places; they said it was some by one thing and some by another. Carey said, by storing potatoes, and selling potatoes and keeping lodgers; and another man by following his tailoring trade, and another by shoemaking.

3057. Then the adverse party could not carry the evidence further upon the matter of fact against the voter than was admitted by the man himself?—Not at all; that was just the fact.

3058. Mr. Hamilton.] Then in many of those cases the individuals admitted that the intrinsic value was under 10 *l*., but they asserted that the value to them was 10 *l*.?—Yes; Counsellor Walsh was furnished with information as to the premises of which notice had been given, and he was enabled to elicit from them by cross-examination all the facts that could be proved with regard to the value, and the people admitted that they paid but so and so.

3059. Mr. O'Connell.] They made a distinction between the intrinsic value and the value to them, by showing how the house was productive to them?—Yes, by lodgers or by storing potatoes, and so on.

3060. Mr. Serjeant Bell.] Were there not, in point of fact, counsel and agents employed to investigate the claims, engaged by the conservative interest?—I suppose so; there was Counsellor Roberts upon one side.

3061. For the popular party?—Yes, Mr. Walsh was brought down specially from Dublin to resist the claims of persons that were considered to be under value.

3062. Who was the attorney?—Mr. Denmead.

3063. In addition to counsel and agents employed, a considerable number of the conservatives attended the registry and assisted?—I do not think they did. I did attend, because I was summoned: I should not have attended if I had not been summoned.

3064. Is it within your recollection that several assisted the counsel and agents in opposing?—No doubt they furnished the agents with information with regard to the value.

3065. The Quakers were in the conservative interest?—Not in the conservative interest.

3066. Did not Mr. Grubb, whom you mentioned, vote?—I do not know whether he has a vote.

3067. Were not the claims of persons who came to be registered as strongly contested as they generally are under such circumstances?—They were.

3068. And it was upon hearing the evidence of the claimants, and any evidence that could be brought forward to oppose them, that the barrister made up his mind either to reject or to allow them?—Yes, that I would say.

3069. Do you happen to know that in point of fact there were above 1,000 notices served for that registry?—I heard that it was about 1,000.

3070. Do you happen to know that about one-half of those were rejected?—No, I am sure there were not; a great number of them never came forward. Some persons put in more than one notice.

3071. Then

3071. Then about one-half of the notices were not registered?—Yes, it was quite a joke, a great number of them putting in.
3072. In point of fact several were rejected?—Several, I suppose, were rejected, but not very many.
3073. Rejected for want of value?—I do not exactly know upon what ground.
3074. What other ground could there be?—I do not know.
3075. Mr. E. Tennent.] Do you remember any who were rejected for defect in those notices?—Not many; but the objections in point of value were not considerable. The truth is, that the harrister generally admitted at the registry all that would undertake to swear that the places were worth at the time 10*l.* a year; and if they could show to him how they made out that it was worth 10*l.* a year, he would admit them.
3076. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But at the same time he admitted evidence, if it was offered, on the other side?—I do not think it was in any instance refused.
3077. Mr. Guthrie is a Protestant?—I heard so.
3078. Do you happen to have heard that the barrister appointed originally to preside at the registry, was Mr. Ryan Kay?—I heard that he was appointed to register at Cashel, and I think it was there an objection was made to him with reference to Clonmel. I think I heard it was with reference to Cashel; and that the people at Cashel were unwilling to have a Roman-catholic barrister, and Mr. Guthrie was sent in place; but I did not hear that that objection originated with the Clonmel people.
3079. In point of fact, Mr. Ryan Kay is a Roman-catholic?—I did not hear the name mentioned. I heard that there was a Roman-catholic gentleman who was first appointed to register in that district.
3080. Are they the same district?—The same.
3081. In point of fact, the conservative gentlemen did not like to have a Roman-catholic registering barrister?—I heard that that was the case at Cashel.
3082. Did you happen to hear that they sent a memorial to the Government?—I suppose it was in the form of a memorial that the objection was made.
3083. The Government yielded to the memorial, and appointed a Protestant?—I suppose so.
3084. It was matter of notoriety?—Yes. I remember, Mr. Fallon, a Roman-catholic, was sent down to the county, and I heard it generally said, that no barrister could discharge his duties more fairly than he did.
3085. Then the result is this, that the conservative gentlemen were mistaken as to both?—They were.
3086. They got Mr. Guthrie, a Protestant, instead of Mr. Ryan Kay?—Yes.
3087. Twenty days' notice is requisite for the registry?—Yes.
3088. So that there was ample time given to investigate the claims, and to ascertain the value of the premises?—There was.
3089. Mr. O'Connell.] Are you registered yourself as a householder or as a freeman?—I am registered as a householder for the town.
3090. Have you been made a freeman?—No.
3091. Before the Reform Bill there never was a contest for Clonmel?—No.
3092. There could not be; it was a close borough?—There could not be.
3093. Mr. Bagwell had the nomination?—Yes, so I should suppose.
3094. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] When you were asked just now, whether you recollect instances of claimants being rejected for want of value, you said that you did, that there were some instances?—I suppose there were.
3095. Do you recollect an entire hatch of butchers being rejected, who sought to register out of their stalls and markets?—Yes; it was considered a complete joke of those men. I do not recollect anything of that myself. All that I know of it is having seen the Minutes of Evidence given by Counsellor Welsh before the Election Committee. He attended from the beginning to the close, and he explained about it before the Committee. I do not know anything about it myself.
3096. Mr. O'Connell.] But, if it be applicable to anybody, it is applicable to the time of Mr. Guthrie?—Not entirely. All agree, that if any were admitted without sufficient value, it was not improperly done.
3097. With respect to the valuation of 1828, it was not the practice or the disposition of the valuers to lean very heavily upon the poorer inhabitants?—We certainly, as far as our judgment enabled us to go, valued every place at the full and improved value, without fear or affection.
3098. But if you had a doubt, you rather leaned in favour of the poorer inhabitants?—

Mr. Joseph Higgins,
12 April 1837.

inhabitants?—Yes, we might have done so. I am not certain as to that, for we knew that we should be sworn to our valuation.

3099. Have you brought that valuation with you?—No; that is with the commissioners.

3100. Do you recollect the house of Thomas Everard, in Johnson-street?—I do.

3101. Do you know what the valuation of that house was?—I do not.

3102. Was it 10 £?—I do not remember; for I did not object to that man; he is not in the list of persons that I objected to.

3103. Suppose that, in point of fact, you valued him only at 6 £, what would you say to that?—As I did not object to that man in my list, I did not take his house into consideration; but I do think it would not let for 10 £.

3104. Suppose that he actually pays 11 £ 15 s. 2 d.?—I think there is some part let off from it, if he pays that.

3105. Do you know Joshua Moore, in Johnson-street?—Yes.

3106. He is not in your list of objections?—No.

3107. Suppose that he is only valued at 6 £, what would you say to that?—I think that is part of Everard's concern; I think that is immediately connected with Everard's house: they are very closely connected together.

3108. Now, supposing he pays 15 £ a year rent?—I am certain that Joshua Moore did not rent any place at the time we made the valuation.

3109. Do you remember Patrick Mooler of Johnson-street?—I have no recollection of him.

3110. Do you remember William Massey, of Johnson-street?—No.

3111. Do you remember John White, of White's-lane?—Yes.

3112. What sort of a house was that?—We valued it at 5 £, but I have heard that he has improved that place. I have not taken any objection to that.

3113. Then, perhaps, you would not be surprised to hear that he pays ten guineas a year rent?—I do not know what he pays.

3114. David Thornton, in Bugwell-street; have you any recollection of the valuation of his house?—David Thornton is a very improving person.

3115. Patrick Kelly, in William-street; do you recollect him?—I know a person of the name of Kelly, in William-street; but he lives in lodgings.

3116. Marks English, in Moreton-street; do you know his house?—Yes.

3117. Have you any recollection of what value you put upon that?—No; he is a person that we could not object to, for he is a most improving man; he has increased his business very much.

3118. Richard Guiton, in Polton-street?—I do not remember what house he lived in in 1828; he lives now in a very respectable house.

3119. You will not undertake to state, that your valuation in 1828 was to be considered accurate at the time of the registry in 1832?—I think that our valuation in 1828 was an accurate one.

3120. At the time of the registry in 1832, you will not say that that valuation afforded an accurate test of the value at that period?—I should not say it did in every case; I should say that it did in very many cases, in the greater proportion of cases.

3121. But in many cases it did not?—In many cases it did not. It could not, from the changes that had taken place.

3122. Independently of the changes; for instance, when you did not go inside the houses, do you mean to say that you might not have been mistaken in your valuation?—We certainly might, but we were as accurate as we could be. We took a great deal of time, and we invariably went together.

3123. Mr. O'Connell.] How were you paid?—Ten pounds for each, for the entire time; that was the sum allowed by the Act of Parliament.

3124. Are you registered in Dublin?—I am not.

3125. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] With respect to the cellars, they are not merely hucksters' shops, but they are sometimes used as workshops?—Very few.

3126. Those cellars are perhaps somewhat peculiar to Clonmel?—So I understand.

3127. A great deal of money has been made in those cellars?—Yes.

3128. Hundreds of pounds?—I have heard of some persons making some money; but I do not think there is much made in them.

3129. Have not they good substantial shops, provision shops and hucksters' shops?

—In the first place, the better description of houses do not let cellars underneath; the more respectable persons prefer keeping the cellars for their own houses.

3130. Are there not a great many cellars in Main-street?—Yes; but the best shops in that street do not let cellars.

3131. Is not it the fact, that some of those cellars pay 10*l.* a year rent?—There may be two or three; scarcely three, I should think.

3132. Do you know a person of the name of John Sawyer?—Yes, I was in his place; and I met Mr. Butler there, who is preparing to come over here.

3133. Mr. Butler went to value as well as you?—Yes.

3134. You went there to ascertain the value?—Yes.

3135. You had rather an indifferent opinion of the value of the premises, and did not you express it before Mr. Butler?—I do not know. The man said he paid 10*l.* I thought that the place was dear enough at 10*l.*; and the man said "I think it is very dear."

3136. Did not you think it was not worth even 5*l.*?—No, I did not think any such thing.

3137. But you had made up your mind that it was not worth 10*l.*?—Not at all.

3138. But you were surprised to hear that he paid 10*l.* a year rent?—Not surprised: I thought it quite enough.

3139. Did not you think it more than enough?—Rather too much. I would say it was the extreme value; that it would not let for more.

3140. Supposing that you had not been assured that that man paid 10*l.* a year rent, if you were asked what is the value of his premises, would you have said that they were worth 10*l.* a year?—I am not sure that I should have said that.

3141. Is it your impression, that you would have said that they were not worth 10*l.* a year?—I cannot say: I thought it was dear enough; the man said it was dear enough, but I felt that I could not make an objection if the man paid 10*l.* a year for it.

3142. *Chairman.*] Would you think it was of the value of 8*l.* a year?—Yes, because it is a butcher's stall, and there is a slaughtering place behind.

3143. Then the house is worth between 8*l.* and 10*l.* a year?—I did not object to it at all.

3144. Mr. Serjeant *Bell.*] Who accompanied you upon that occasion?—I think it was Mr. Legg.

3145. Did not Mr. Smith accompany you also?—I think he did not; but I think we met Mr. Smith, and we mentioned that we had been there.

3146. Is Mr. Smith the gentleman who is a valuator?—Yes.

3147. Is he the gentleman that was said to have fired out of his house at the people?—I believe it was.

3148. Mr. *Legg.*] Upon what occasion?—I think it was during the days of a contested election, when a very violent assault had been made. I think he did not fire; but he is a determined man, and I think he laid hold of some of his fire-arms. He was aroused up out of bed.

3149. Mr. Serjeant *Bell.*] Did not Mr. Smith and Mr. Legg consider that those premises were not worth 10*l.* a year?—I think that Mr. Smith said that they were: the man paid 10*l.* for them. Mr. Smith has a corn-stall convenient to it, and knew the place well.

3150. Then you do not recollect that any of the three said, that the premises were not worth 5*l.*?—Not at all; we could not say that.

3151. Do you know Richard Hogan's cellar, in Dublin-street?—No.

3152. Do you happen to know who registered from 1832 to 1835?—Mr. Hobson.

3153. Mr. Howley succeeded him in 1835, and he has been the registering barrister ever since?—He has.

3154. Do you know Thomas Holmes?—Yes.

3155. Do you know anything of his premises?—Yes.

3156. Is he in your list of objections?—No, he is not; we considered that the place was not one to which fair objection could be taken.

3157. Do you know how Thomas Holmes voted at the election; did not he vote for Mr. Bagwell?—I heard so.

3158. Would you be surprised to hear that he paid but 4*l.* a year rent?—I should be greatly surprised, for I was up stairs in his house, and went through his house for the purpose of making an examination.

3159. Was that lately?—Yes.

Mr. Joseph Higgins.

10 April 1837.

Mr. Joseph Higgins.

12 April 1837.

3160. Was he in your valuation?—I do not know whether that man lived there at the time.
3161. Was his house in your valuation?—It must have been.
3162. That is to say, you considered it worth about 5*l.* at that time?—I should say so.
3163. Of course you would be surprised to find that he paid only 4*l.* a year rent?—I should be greatly surprised.
3164. Mr. O'Connell.] Counsel and agents were employed in what is called the "corporation interest"?—Yes, Mr. Bagwell's.
3165. Were you residing in Cloumel when Mr. Bagwell purchased the borough from Lord Mountcashel?—I should think not. I was born in Cloumel, and I suppose I was very young at the time, if I was there.
3166. You have no recollection of the mode in which the borough was transferred?—None at all; I know nothing at all about the borough affairs.
3167. Did you ever happen to hear how much Mr. Bagwell got for the seats from Massey Dawson?—I never heard that he got anything, and I am rather inclined to think he never did. They were very intimate. Mr. Dawson might have given him a lift for the county, but I do not suppose that he ever got money. There was a connexion between the families by marriage.

Mr. William Smith, called in; and Examined.

Mr. William Smith.

3168. Chairman.] Are you a merchant at Cloumel?—A corn merchant.
3169. You were examined before the Committee of the House of Commons upon the Cloumel election of 1833?—I was.
3170. Had you resided in Cloumel previous to that time, and also subsequent?—I did.
3171. Mr. Hamilton.] Were you a valuator, in 1828, under the 9th Geo. 4?—I was.
3172. Will you state the principle upon which that valuation was made by you?—There were two gentlemen appointed with me to value the town: we received instructions from the Committee to value the town at the utmost value of the houses; and we did so accordingly.
3173. Did you find any difficulty in obtaining information from the parties whose houses you valued?—No, we did not.
3174. Did you, for the most part, go into the houses to make personal inspection?—In such cases as we had any doubt about, we went into the houses: other we did not go into.
3175. How far did you make the rent the measure of value, where you were able to ascertain it?—I cannot say that I was acquainted with the rents of the premises at the time we made the valuation; we valued them according to the situation: for instance, a house in the main street we looked upon to be more valuable than a house in the back part of the town.
3176. Mr. O'Connell.] You did not value them with regard to the rent, but from the situation?—According to situation.
3177. Not from the rent?—When I had a doubt about it, if one of my companions said, "You are valuing too high," I would then ask the rent.
3178. Mr. Hamilton.] Did you take into account, in your valuation, the advantages of situation?—I did.
3179. Did you take into account the advantages of the house for any particular business?—Decidedly.
3180. For instance, if the house was fitted up with a butcher's stall?—Yes.
3181. Mr. O'Connell.] You considered the rent and the value different things, and that a valuable house might be at a low rent?—Yes, it might.
3182. Mr. Hamilton.] Were there many appeals against your valuation?—There were, I think, 20 or 30.
3183. How were those appeals, for the most part, decided? Was the valuation confirmed or reduced?—It was reduced, I think, in every instance of an appeal. There were very few appeals that were not reduced, in consequence of its being considered that we valued them too high; and I must say that one of my co-partners in the valuation thought himself that we had valued too high.
3184. Mr. O'Connell.] Who was that?—James Shee.
3185. Mr. Hamilton.] Has that valuation been acted upon up to the present time?—It has.

3186. Did you attend the registration, in 1832?—I did, a part of the time; not all the time.

3187. You were summoned?—I was.

3188. Did you give evidence in any case?—In one case, I did.

3189. In whose case was that?—I think it was a man of the name of William Kelly.

3190. Were you present when the claimant himself was examined?—I was.

3191. What was the nature of the evidence which he gave?—He stated that he paid 8*l.* Irish for his place; and it was worth to him 10*l.*

3192. Was he cross-examined?—He was.

3193. Can you state the nature of the cross-examination?—All that I recollect was this; that he stated that the place to him was worth 10*l.*, and I have a recollection of his having said, that a solvent tenant would pay 10*l.*; but I would not like to state that positively. If I am allowed, I could go into the after conversation that I had with him.

3194. Was there any other witness examined, except yourself?—No.

3195. What was the evidence which you gave?—That the place was not worth more than 8*l.* British money.

3196. What was his rent?—Eight pounds Irish. I was sent for two or three different times; but I did not go: I had a good deal to do. I had no assistance; but when I got down, Mr. Walsh was employed on the part of Mr. Bagwell, who was then understood to be one of the candidates.

3197. Mr. O'Connell.] In the corporation interest?—Yes. When I got into court Mr. Walsh told me there was no use in producing me as a witness.

3198. That was a private conversation between you and him?—I would not call it a private conversation.

3199. It was not addressed to the court?—No.

3200. Mr. Hamilton.] What was the decision of the barrister in regard to that claimant?—The reply of the barrister was this, that notwithstanding the evidence of this gentleman, the man was to be registered.

3201. Did he give any reason?—Yes; he said the man was the best judge of the value of his own premises.

3202. Was it in consequence of that that you declined to give further evidence?—It was. There was great excitement in the court: I was called on repeatedly afterwards, and refused going forward.

3203. Did you attend in court, though not examined as a witness?—I did, a length of time after that.

3204. Can you state whether, in other cases, the barrister acted upon the same principle?—I was not by at the examination; there were other persons examined, but that was previous to my examination.

3205. Have you attended any registration since?—No.

3206. From the circumstance of your having been a valuator, you are pretty well acquainted with the value of houses in Clonmel?—I am.

3207. Are you acquainted with the house of Thomas Kelly in Gravel-walk?—Perfectly well.

3208. What, in your opinion, is the value of that house?—I do not think any person would give more than 3*l.* a year for it. It is a miserable place: it is a thatched cabin, and I could not stand erect under the eave of it.

3209. How many rooms are there in it?—Two little rooms and a kitchen.

3210. Is it a stone house or a mud house?—I rather think it a stone house; it is a small thatched cabin.

3211. Has it a floor?—An earthen floor.

3212. What is the rent?—I took from the landlord's book the rent, 2*l.* 15*s.* 5*d.* annually.

3213. Is there any stall, or anything of the kind, to give it additional value?—Since he took the place, the man himself built a small shed; and there is a very small yard attached to it.

3214. Is the shed occupied separately from the house?—It is used as a potato house.

3215. The value you set upon it includes all the premises?—Yes.

3216. Are you aware whether Thomas Kelly is registered?—Yes: I saw him vote at that election; one time for one candidate, and another time for another candidate.

Mr. William Smith.

12 April 1837.

3217. Mr. O'Connell.] He had a reason for that?—Yes; and a great many more had reasons for it too.
3218. *Chairman.*] You mean in different interests?—Yes; and I have no doubt he would do the same to-morrow.
3219. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you call him an impartial voter?—I do not know; it would be the man that would pay him best that he would vote for.
3220. Mr. Hamilton.] He is not much of a politician?—I do not know.
3221. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] His politics begin at home?—Yes.
3222. And end there?—Yes.
3223. Mr. Hamilton.] Are you acquainted with the house of Nicholas Lynch, in Gravel-walk?—I am, perfectly.
3224. Will you describe that house?—It is a similar house to Keily's: a thatched cabin, with a very small yard indeed. I do not know that I could even call it a garden; it is not half the size of this room; it is a little yard, and a small pig-house.
3225. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] He has a trade?—He has the trade of a shoemaker; and an industrious proper man as any that I know.
3226. Mr. Hamilton.] What value do you set upon that house?—Just equal to the other: perhaps there might be 10 s. difference in the value.
3227. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] On which side is the 10 s.?—I think they are near about the same thing; there may be 10 s. difference; from 3 l. to 3 l. 10 s.
3228. Do you deliberately say, that that house is not worth more than 3 l. 10 s.?—Indeed, I do not think it is.
3229. Have you seen it lately?—I have.
3230. Just before you came over?—Yes.
3231. And you say that it is not worth more than 3 l. 10 s.?—I do not think it is worth more than 3 l. 10 s.
3232. Mr. Hamilton.] What rent does he pay?—£2. 15 s. 5 d.
3233. How do you know that?—I took it from the landlord's rent-book.
3234. Who is the landlord?—Thomas Taylor.
3235. Mr. O'Connell.] Is there a middle landlord?—I believe not: the property belongs to Mr. Taylor.
3236. You would be surprised if it turned out that that man pays 10 l.?—Indeed I would.
3237. Mr. Hamilton.] Was his house included in the valuation of 1828?—No.
3238. Was he a registered voter?—Yes.
3239. James Gleeson, of Gravel-walk, stone-mason; do you know his house?—Yes.
3240. Is that a similar house to the others?—No, it is a slated house.
3241. What value do you set upon it?—Five pounds.
3242. Was it included in the valuation of 1828?—I cannot recollect that.
3243. Do you know the rent?—I think the rent is 4 l. I can tell by referring to a book I have.
3244. Timothy Carew, of Cherry-tree-lane; what value do you set on his house?—Five pounds would be the extreme value of it.
3245. Do you know whether it is included in the valuation of 1828?—I am not positive; I cannot speak to that.
3246. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] He voted for Mr. Bagwell?—He voted for Mr. Rounyne one time, and Mr. Bagwell the next.
3247. Mr. Hamilton.] From what document did you take that book?—I have some of the documents since the time of the registry; they are not inserted in this book, but I have taken them from a former book; some of them I took at a former period, when I was summoned on Mr. Bagwell's petition.
3248. From whence did you derive your information as to the rent of this man's house?—From the landlord's book.
3249. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] What you have got there is a copy from your own book?—Some of the memorandums I have copied afresh.
3250. So that that is a copy of a copy?—With respect to the rent, it is. The rent of Timothy Carew's is 4 l.
3251. Richard Butler, tailor, of Borchreens; what is his house?—It is a slated house, with two small rooms and a kitchen, and then there are two rooms over that and a garret, with a very small yard; no garden.
3252. How is Borchreens in point of situation?—It is the back part of the town.

3253. What

3253. What do you value that house at?—Six pounds at the utmost, in my opinion. *Mr. William Smith.*
3254. Do you know what is the rent?—The rent is 5 l. 10 s. *12 April 1837*
3255. James Fitzgerald, of Gravel-walk, carpenter?—That is a small slated house directly opposite my stores.
3256. What value do you set upon it?—I think 5 l. would be the value.
3257. What is the rent?—I cannot speak as to the rent; the man is dead.
3258. Was he a registered voter?—He was.
3259. John Hall, St. Stephen's-lane; do you know his house?—That is a thatched house, with about a quarter of an acre of ground attached to it.
3260. What value did you set upon that?—Five pounds.
3261. Do you know his rent?—No.
3262. Martin Morony, New-street, cooper; what value do you set upon his house?—I think 6 l. is the utmost value.
3263. Was that included in the valuation of 1828?—I am not aware without reference to the book.
3264. *Mr. O'Connell.* Do you know his rent?—I can tell by referring.
3265. Your valuation has no reference to his rent?—None whatever. I was in his house a few days before I left Ireland; the poor man was very ill, and he had me called in, and he said to me, "Strike them all off to the devil; I have never had a day's luck since I got my register." He thought I came for the purpose of breaking his vote, as they call it.
3266. Who did he vote for?—For Mr. Ronayne.
3267. Upon both occasions?—I think he did.
3268. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.* Was his house included in the valuation?—I cannot say.
3269. If his house was worth 6 l., how is it that you cannot say whether it was included in the valuation?—I cannot say; it would be impossible that I can recollect all that we valued at that time without reference to the valuation-book.
3270. Your judgment is, that it is worth 6 l.?—Yes.
3271. Then, if so, why was not it in the valuation?—I cannot say whether it was or was not.
3272. *Mr. Hamilton.* What would you value it at now?—At the same.
3273. *Chairman.* You are not now one of the commissioners?—No; I was never a commissioner.
3274. Have you any access to their books?—I could have access to the books as a rate-payer.
3275. But you have no official knowledge of the books?—No.
3276. *Mr. Hamilton.* William Davis, New-street, shoemaker; was his house included in the valuation of 1828?—I could not answer without seeing the book.
3277. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.* William Davis voted for Mr. Bagwell?—He did.
3278. *Mr. Hamilton.* Will you describe the house of William Davis?—He has got a small kitchen, with two rooms, and two rooms over that; one of them is a garret-room, with a small yard.
3279. What value do you attach to that house?—I think it is worth 6 l.
3280. Do you know the rent?—I have not got the rent.
3281. Is he registered?—He is, and voted.
3282. *Mr. O'Connell.* How did he vote?—He voted for Mr. Bagwell.
3283. At both elections?—I think, at both elections.
3284. *Mr. Hamilton.* Martin Callaghan, New-street, shoemaker, what sort of a house is his?—It is a house of the very same description as William Davis's.
3285. Martin Callaghan is dead?—He is.
3286. *Mr. O'Connell.* Did you know the rent of that?—No, I do not.
3287. Then, of course, your valuation has no connexion with the rent?—No.
3288. *Mr. Hamilton.* Was he a voter?—He was.
3289. Who did he vote for?—He voted, on both occasions, for Mr. Bagwell.
3290. Thomas Walsh, New-street, smith; do you know his house?—It is a very wretched forge; no habitation whatever, and nothing but a thatched forge. The roof has been repaired since, but at the time he registered, and at the time he voted, the roof had scarcely any thatch upon it.
3291. He is another of Mr. Bagwell's men?—He is.
3292. What valuation do you put upon the house?—It is not worth more than 3 l.
3293. Do

Mr. *William Smith*.

12 April 1837.

3293. Do you know his rent?—I believe he pays no rent; at least the entire square is generally in arrears, and the houses have all fallen, and it is going to be converted into a potato market.

3294. *Sir R. Ferguson*.] Was it from the forge alone that he registered, or from the house?—Yes; he has no house.

3295. Has he a dwelling in the town?—Not immediately in the town.

3296. Is the place where he resides within the borough?—I do not know whether it is or not.

3297. *Mr. Serjeant Ball*.] But whether he registered out of the forge or not, you had no objection to his vote?—No; he voted for Mr. Bagwell.

3298. Are you certain whether it was out of the forge, or out of his residence, that he registered?—Out of the forge.

3299. *Bartholomew Fennesey*, of Irish Town, nailor?—I was present at the time he registered, and he was questioned with respect to his hold upon the premises: the premises were divided at the time. *Mr. Walsh* was instructed that he held but part of the premises; and he swore that he paid 10*l.* or 10*l.* 10*s.* for them, and then he was registered out of the entire premises. At that period he had two rooms and the yard let, and the place that he occupied. I think there is no person that would give more than 7*l.* for it; but decidedly, if he was at liberty to register out of the entire concern, it was well worth 10*l.*

3300. *Mr. Hamilton*.] Part of it was let to lodgers?—Yes; he had divided the house, and let part of it to lodgers.

3301. *Mr. Serjeant Ball*.] He has a trade also?—Yes, he is a nailor.

3302. Is not that a good trade in Cloomel?—No; it is a bad trade, since the metal nails came so much into use.

3303. *John Collins*, of *Sherlock's-lane*; do you know his house?—I do.

3304. What value do you estimate it at?—Six pounds.

3305. Do you know the rent?—No, I do not. He voted also for Mr. Bagwell.

3306. *William Burke*, of *Duckett-street*; do you know his house?—I do; it consists of a kitchen and two small bed-rooms, and two rooms over, with a small yard. I think it would be valued at 8*l.* 10*s.*

3307. *Mr. O'Connell*.] Do you know his rent?—His rent is 7*l.* 7*s.* 9*d.*

3308. *Mr. Serjeant Ball*.] Was not he one of Mr. Bagwell's men?—I believe he was. I have great doubts about it, whether he did not vote one time against Mr. Bagwell, and another time for him.

3309. *James Wholohan*, of *Duckett-street*?—He has a better house than Burke has, but at the time that he registered it was not; but he has since improved it by building slated linneys, which he lets to lodgers. At the time that he registered it was not better than Burke's.

3310. Do you value it at the same?—The rent is the same; but James Wholohan was not the owner of the house at the time he registered; his brother John was the owner, and his brother John then went into service; John let the house to lodgers, and he let his brother James in, and gave him one room for collecting the weekly rents for him; and he registered then out of the entire house.

3311. *Mr. O'Connell*.] And he is now the sole proprietor?—No; his brother John is still the proprietor.

3312. *Chairmen*.] Did they both register out of the house?—No; John, the owner of the house, did not register.

3313. Where does the other brother live?—He is a servant.

3314. His brother did live in it, and was registered?—Yes.

3315. *Mr. O'Connell*.] Has he left it since?—I believe he has.

3316. *Mr. Serjeant Ball*.] You would say that, at all events, the house now is worth 10*l.*?—No, I do not think it is.

3317. How much was it worth before the improvement?—Eight pounds.

3318. Does not he get more than 20*s.* a year from lodgers for each linney?—I should think he does.

3319. Then that would bring it beyond 10*l.*?—It would.

3320. Then, on consideration, you think it is worth 10*l.*?—I do not think a tenant going into it would give 10*l.* for it.

3321. *Mr. O'Connell*.] But it produces more than 10*l.* a year?—I believe he pays 8*l.* a year rent for it.

3322. He has 8*l.* worth in his own occupation; and he has, besides, two linneys let at more than 20*s.* a year each?—I will not say that they are let.

3323. But, if let, they would produce that amount?—Yes, they would.

3324. Would

3324. Would not each of those linneys, if let, produce 1 s. a week?—No, they would not; perhaps about 8 d. a week each.
3325. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Thomas Boyd, of Duckett-street?—Thomas Boyd has a similar house to William Burke's; it is about 8 l. a year in value: two rooms, and the rooms are very small rooms, taken off of the kitchen, and two rooms over head, and a small yard.
3326. *Chairman*.] Have you a printed copy of the register of voters for Clonmel?—I have a printed copy, which I obtained from the clerk of the peace.
3327. Is that from 1832 up to the present time?—Yes, it includes up to the year 1836: there has been a registry last month.
3328. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Are you aware whether it is a correct list of the voters?—He has signed it as a correct list of the voters up to the present time.

[*The Witness delivered in the same.*]

3329. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Do you know Boyd's rent?—£. 7. 7 s. 9 d.
3330. Is he a voter?—He is.
3331. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.]—He is a shoemaker by trade?—Yes.
3332. Do you happen to know that Boyd lets lodgings?—He does: the greater part of them let lodgings.
3333. Is not his house in the neighbourhood of the barracks?—It is not far from the barracks.
3334. Does not that make houses of that description rather more valuable?—I think it does.
3335. Do you know that he has a yard attached to it?—He has a yard and a pig-house.
3336. Do you know also that about two years ago he took those premises at 12 l. a year rent?—No; I am not aware of that.
3337. What do you state as to the value of this house? You see it pays 8 l. 10 s. and he lets lodgings; it is in the neighbourhood of barracks, and he has this yard and piggery in the rear; what value would you put upon it?—I would not say, if it was to be let to-morrow, that more than 8 l. 10 s. would be expected for it.
3338. Mr. *O'Connell*.] The question is not what rent it would get; but would it not be worth, to a man occupying it, 10 l. a year?—I do not think it would.
3339. If he pays 8 l. 10 s. for it, must not he have some profit upon his money?—He does not pay 8 l. 10 s. for it, but I think that is the value of it.
3340. What do you say the rent ought to be?—I think the rent would be about 8 l.
3341. Then, upon his 8 l. rent, you would only give him 10 s. profit?—I think he would get as good a house as that for 8 l.
3342. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Will you keep rent and value distinct in your mind: do you mean to say that a tenant paying 8 l. a year rent would not be considered to have a 10 l. interest?—If I am to take the letting of the lodgings into the question, then he would.
3343. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Taking into consideration the letting of the lodgings, there is no question that it would be worth 10 l. a year?—No doubt it would.
3344. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Patrick Hickey, in Duckett-street?—It is a similar description of house.
3345. Taking into account the power of letting lodgings, you consider it would be worth 10 l. a year?—Yes, if I am to take into consideration what a man would make by it.
3346. John Ryan?—He is dead. It is a similar house, and the yard is not so good.
3347. Where did he live?—In Duckett-street.
3348. John Everard, nailor, in Bagwell-street?—He has a nailor's forge in a very small slated house.
3349. What do you value it at?—Eight pounds.
3350. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Do you know what the rent is?—I believe about 7 l.
3351. Is he a general blacksmith?—No, a nailor.
3352. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] There is a yard attached to it?—Yes.
3353. Has he a shop?—There is a nailor's forge; the two are in one.
3354. Is not that a good situation for such a trade as that?—Yes.
3355. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Do you take that into account, in stating the value?—

Yes.

o.39.

Mr. William Smith.

12 April 1837.

3356. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you happen to know, that he has built upon his premises?—No.
3357. What would you say, if it appeared that he pays 7 l. 10 s.?—I cannot say.
3358. Mr. Hamilton.] Patrick Burke, in Dispensary-street?—That is a wretched place; it consists of one room, commonly called the kitchen, which he converted into a forge, and over that was his bed-room.
3359. What would you value that at?—Three pounds, or three pounds ten shillings, would be the extreme value of it.
3360. Was he a registered voter?—He was.
3361. Timothy Dooley, 10, Dispensary-street?—That is a better place a good deal.
3362. What do you value that at?—Eight pounds.
3363. Do you know the rent?—I believe the rent is 8 l. Irish.
3364. Has he the power of taking lodgers there?—He has.
3365. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] What is he by trade?—I believe he is a labourer.

Veneris, 14^o die Aprilis, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.
 Sir Robert Ferguson.
 Mr. French.
 Mr. Hamilton.

Mr. Hogg.
 Mr. Lefroy.
 Mr. Morgan John O'Connell.
 Lord Granville Somerset.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. William Smith, called in; and further Examined.

Mr. William Smith.

14 April 1837.

3366. Mr. Hamilton.] DO you know the house occupied by William Russell weaver, Dispensary-street?—I do.
3367. Describe that house?—It consists of a kitchen and two small rooms on the same floor with the kitchen, and two rooms up stairs; there is a small yard and a very small garden of equal breadth with the house, about 30 feet long; a very small garden attached to the house.
3368. The house which is in front being 30 feet?—No, the garden; the house is not quite the breadth of the garden; 30 feet long the garden is.
3369. What extent do you suppose the front of the house to be?—I should think about 16 feet.
3370. Is it thatched or slated?—It is slated.
3371. Two stories or one?—There are two rooms over the kitchen, and two small bed-rooms on the same floor as the kitchen.
3372. What do you conceive to be the value of that house?—£. 7 a year I reckon the value of it.
3373. Was it included in the valuation of 1828?—It was.
3374. Chairman.] At what rate?—I do not know; I have not seen the valuation book since I valued the town.
3375. Mr. Hamilton.] Is William Russell a registered elector?—He is.
3376. Is any part of the house let off?—In general in all those sort of houses there are lodgers taken in; perhaps two or three families. I have seen six families lodging in a small room.
3377. Chairman.] But not in that house?—Not in that house.
3378. Were there any lodgers in this house to your knowledge?—I cannot say there were; but there might have been without my knowing whether there were lodgers or not, for they are very much in the habit of letting one room to two or three families.
3379. Mr. Hamilton.] What is the usual rent payable with reference to such houses?—The rent is 5 l. 10 s. 9 d.
3380. I speak of lodgers?—Some pay 4 d. a week, some perhaps 2 d.; just room for them to put a little straw and a little covering, and lay down in a corner.
3381. So that if there were lodgers in a house of that kind, you would estimate the

14 April 1837.

the produce of the lodgers at 4 *d.* or 2 *d.* a week a family?—In some cases they pay 10 *d.* a week, but then they would have the entire room.

3382. *Chairman.*] How much money could the occupier of this house make in the course of the year by letting it out in lodgings? What is the maximum?—I should think he might make from 3 *l.* to 4 *l.*, according to the quantity of rooms he can spare from his family.

3383. *Mr. French.*] In that house, according to the description you have given of it, there are two rooms and a kitchen on the lower floor?—Yes.

3384. And two rooms of a larger description, I presume, in the upper?—Yes.

3385. Now you state that the landlord could get from lodgers 3 *l.* or 4 *l.* a year?—That would depend on the quantity of rooms he could spare from his family.

3386. If he could let the two upper rooms at 1 *s.* a week each, he would have 5 *l.* from those two rooms alone?—Yes.

3387. It might be that one room and the kitchen would be sufficient for himself?—It might.

3388. *Chairman.*] Do you think he could let one of those upper rooms for 2 *l.* 12 *s.* a year?—Indeed, I think he would get 1 *s.* a week for it.

3389. By yearly occupancy?—No, it is by the week that they generally take them.

3390. When you say by the week, does not that include some weeks in which he could get no lodgers at all?—Yes; some weeks they are very frequently without any.

3391. Therefore he would not get 2 *l.* 12 *s.* for one twelvemonth by letting one of those rooms?—No, I do not think he would.

3392. *Mr. French.*] You stated the rent of that house to be 5 *l.* 10 *s.* 9 *d.*?—Yes.

3393. This man is registered, I suppose, on what is called the liberal side?—He is.

3394. Was there any opposition on the part of the conservatives to that registry?—There was.

3395. And notwithstanding, I take for granted, it was proved that 5 *l.* 10 *s.* 9 *d.* was the amount of his rent?—No, it was proved the house was of the value of about 8 *l.*, and the man admitted at that time. I was afterwards giving evidence in a case of almost a next door neighbour of his before the revising barrister, and this man came on the table, and he was asked as to the value of his house; he then said, "Mr. Smith makes it worth 8 *l.* a year," and was going to explain how he proved it to be worth to him 10 *l.* a year; Mr. Ronayne, the late member for our borough, stopped him, and would not allow him to explain how it was worth to him the 10 *l.* a year; the man afterwards admitted to me (for I recollect his words) that I was perfectly correct as to the value, and that if he had known he should have to swear to the real value of the place, he would not swear it was worth 10 *l.*, for that no tenant would give 10 *l.* a year for it.

3396. Did the man swear his house was worth 10 *l.*?—He did; "It is worth to me 10 *l.*"

3397. Was there any evidence put up to prove it was not worth 10 *l.*?—No; he was cross-examined as to that.

3398. He was cross-examined?—Yes.

3399. And after his cross-examination the barrister registered him?—He did.

3400. You were aware his rent at that very time was but 5 *l.*?—Not then; it is since that I ascertained his rent.

3401. You could have ascertained it by putting the question to him?—Yes, I could, but I did not do so.

3402. Was it ascertained then?—Not to my knowledge.

3403. *Mr. Hamilton.*] You stated you recollect the man's words; do you mean to say the man's words to you afterwards were, that if he had known he had to swear to the real value, he would not have sworn it was worth 10 *l.*?—Precisely.

3404. *Mr. Levey.*] Do you recollect what was elicited on the cross-examination?—The only thing was, his stating it to be worth to him from his business and the letting of lodgings; he stated it, on cross-examination, to be worth to him 10 *l.*, which was the general way that the answers were given to the revising barrister.

Mr. William Smith.

14 April 1837.

3405. *Chairman.*] What was his business?—A weaver.

3406. *Mr. Hamilton.*] In estimating the value of that house at 8 *l.* or 7 *l.* a year, do you include the capability of letting out part for lodgings amongst other things?—Indeed I would; for I know a house in the immediate neighbourhood, recently built, to be let at a similar rent.

3407. *Chairman.*] Suppose you were the landlord of that house, would you let it for 7 *l.* a year?—Indeed I would let his house for 7 *l.* a year; it is as good as houses in the immediate vicinity.

3408. You would think you got the full value of it?—Decidedly.

3409. *Mr. French.*] Have you known houses of that description bring 10 *l.* a year?—Never.

3410. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Were many persons registered on the same principle, namely, swearing that the house was to them of a particular value?—A great number.

3411. Then, of course, according as a man's trade was in its nature more or less lucrative, that man would be qualified to vote or not?—According to his oath he would.

3412. It would not depend upon the value of the house, but upon the nature of his trade?—Exactly so. For instance, suppose a shoemaker, living in a thatched cabin, will swear, from his trade, it is worth to him 10 *l.*, that he makes of it by his business 10 *l.*; and there is no question but that every one of those poor creatures that did so laboured under the impression that they were doing what was perfectly correct in swearing it was worth to them 10 *l.*

3413. *Mr. French.*] Do you mean to say you have known any instance such as you have just mentioned, such as a shoemaker registering, swearing his house was worth to him 10 *l.* a year on account of his trade?—I will not say as to his trade, but that it was worth it: it was understood by all parties what he alluded to was his trade; I gave an instance the day before yesterday, of a shoemaker living in a miserable place, and swearing it was worth to him 10 *l.*; it was concluded that, from his business as a shoemaker, he made 10 *l.* a year by it.

3414. *Mr. Hamilton.*] You have already stated, that a great many of the claimants who were examined by the barrister, admitted that the house was not intrinsically worth 10 *l.*, while they swore it was worth 10 *l.* to them on account of their particular trade?—Just so.

3415. Do you know the house of William Carew?—I do.

3416. What business does he follow?—He is dead.

3417. What was his occupation?—He was a labourer, as well as I recollect.

3418. His house was No. 15, Dispensary-street?—Yes.

3419. Will you describe the house?—It is a similar house to the one I just described; but that would have a back house at the rear, and of course it is rather more valuable than that.

3420. What value do you set upon it?—£.8. would be the extreme value of it.

3421. Was he a registered voter?—He was.

3422. Do you know the house of Patrick Roach and Patrick Toole?—I do.

3423. Do they occupy the same house?—The same house; both registered out of the same house.

3424. Describe the house?—It consists of two rooms and a kitchen on the ground floor, two rooms up stairs; there is a good sized yard, a garden, and two back houses built on the yard.

3425. *Mr. French.*] Are they offices?—They are; such as turf-houses or potato-houses: I consider that the full value is 10 *l.*

3426. *Chairman.*] What is the size of the garden?—It is about 20 feet by 14 as near as I can say. I cannot speak positively to it, but I consider the premises worth 10 *l.*; and the only objection to that was the two voting out of one house of the value of 10 *l.*

3427. *Sir Robert Ferguson.*] Were they both registered at the same registration?—Without referring to the book I could not tell; I rather think they were registered at one time.

3428. *Mr. French.*] Then they proved the house of the value of 20 *l.*?—No, not more than the value of 10 *l.*

3429. How do you mean that both registered then?—Patrick Roach was tenant, and he went up and got registered: he let part of it to Toole, and he registered also.

3430. *Mr.*

3430. Mr. *Hamilton*.] In your opinion, in order to qualify two to register, the house ought to have been worth 20 *l*. instead of 10 *l*.?—In my opinion it ought.
3431. Patrick Burke, 12, Dispensary-street; are you acquainted with his house?
—I am.
3432. What do you conceive to be its value annually?—The rent, or the value?
The value?—*l*. 8.
3433. *Chairman*.] What is the rent?—The rent is but 7 *l*.; he paid 7 *l*. 7 *s*. 8 *d*. for it, and he applied to his landlord, stating it to be too dear; and he got a reduction of 7 *s*. 8 *d*., so that his rent is but 7 *l*.
3435. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Was that previous to his registering?—I cannot say; I took that memorandum from the landlord's book respecting the reduction.
3436. Mr. *French*.] You do not know when that reduction was made?—I do not.
3437. Was this voter opposed at the registry?—I do not think he was: he was, in all probability, as most of them were, cross-examined.
3438. Did he pay a fine for the holding?—He did not.
3439. Are you aware, from your own knowledge, that he did not?—I could not swear he did not; but so far as the best of my opinion goes, that is my opinion; because I know the poor man could not afford to pay a fine; nor would his landlord accept a fine, for it is annual property divided between two sisters and a brother.
3440. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Do you know a house occupied by John and Edward Durney, 32, Mary-street?—I do.
3441. They are tailors, I believe?—They are tailors. The house is worth 14 *l*. a year; but the father and son registered out of it. I was present at the registry; when the names were called out, the father said it was a mistake respecting the son; that the premises were his, and as soon as the father had been registered, or in the course of a very short time, the son got registered. The father and son registered out of the same premises.
3442. Mr. *Hagg*.] Do you recollect what the statement of the son was?—No, I do not.
3443. Mr. *French*.] The father and son registered out of the same house?
—Yes.
3444. That house you conceive to be of the value of 14 *l*.?—I do.
3445. Mr. *Hagg*.] Are you able to tell what did pass when the son was registered?—No, I am not.
3446. I mean, what questions were put by the barrister?—No, not when the son registered.
3447. Explanatory of the statement of the father, who swore the entire belonged to him, it is difficult after that account to understand that the son could be registered as a matter of course, without some explanation, and without recalling the father?—There might have been an explanation, but I cannot state it. I did not remain in court during the entire of the registry; I was occasionally in and out.
3448. Mr. *French*.] Did not some person, on the part of the conservatives, remain in the room?—There was counsel employed, and an agent also.
3449. The counsel, I take for granted, was aware of that fact?—No doubt he was.
3450. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] And besides the counsel and agent, there were several other persons present?—There were numbers.
3451. It was quite a public proceeding?—Quite so.
3452. Mr. *Lefroy*.] What counsel and agent do you mean; do you mean those opposing the vote?—Yes.
3453. Have you any doubt that the objection must have been taken?—No doubt whatever in cross-examination; that he was cross-examined to it.
3454. And with that fact brought out, the registering barrister registered him?
—He did.
3455. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] But you do not undertake to say what explanation was given subsequently?—No, I do not.
3456. Mr. *French*.] Did the conservative agent and counsel object to any voters while you were present?—They did.
3457. Did they cross-examine them?—They did.
3458. Did they produce witnesses to invalidate the testimony given by those persons claiming to vote?—They did.

Mr. William Smith.

14 April 1837.

Mr. William Smith.

3459. Was there any person rejected while you were present?—There was a butcher.

14 April 1837.

3460. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you mean to say there was only one butcher?—I only saw one butcher come forward.

3461. Is it not the fact that a hatch of butchers were rejected?—It is not; there was no hatch of butchers rejected.

3462. Are you speaking of the registry of Mr. Guthrie?—I am. There was a butcher, a very notorious character in the town, came forward to register out of a stall in the market; and there was a burst of indignation, I may very fairly state, from all parties. This man came forward to register out of a stall in the back shambles; and he came forward, and swore the stall to be worth 10*l.* to him. There was then, as I stated before, a general degree of indignation expressed by all parties; and Mr. Ronayne, who attended the registry, stated to his worship, "Your worship," says he, "we shall not press this case." The barrister replied, "I believe I must reject this case." "Very well, your worship," said Mr. Ronayne. Then there was another butcher coming forward, and two witnesses were produced. I should state the two witnesses were produced in the case of the butcher, to prove there was no stall in the market worth 10*l.* a year before he was rejected. The second butcher came forward; but Mr. Ronayne desired him to keep back, for that he could not be registered; this I was present at. There were a number of butchers, who I believe would have come forward to register, but for the decision in his case.

3463. And that rejection of the butcher appears to have met with general acclamation?—It did.

3464. From the popular party as well as the other?—It did.

3465. Mr. Hamilton.] In that case, did the butcher swear that the stall was to him worth 10*l.*?—He did.

3466. But there was contradictory evidence?—There was. There was a very respectable victualler produced, and he swore there was no stall in the shambles worth 10*l.* a year, and that was corroborated by a second witness.

3467. Do you know the house of Thomas Sheehy, in Blind-street?—I do.

3468. What is he?—A butcher. It is a very small thatched house, in very bad repair at the time of his registry; I believe up to this moment too; there is a small yard with a small thatched house at the rear on the yard; the utmost value of that house would be 5*l.*

3469. Is he a voter?—He is.

3470. You include the value of the back house in that?—Yes.

3471. Do you know the house of William Gorman, in Bagwell-street?—There is no house; he held a forge there.

3472. What do you value the forge at, then?—Not worth more than 5*l.*; it was a shed; he had a shed up against the wall.

3473. Do you know the house of Stephen Mara, of Blind-street?—Yes; that is a thatched house with about a quarter of an acre of ground attached to it, on which he has grown some wheat.

3474. What value do you set on it?—I think it is worth 6*l.*, allowing 2*l.* 10*s.* for the quarter of an acre of ground, and 3*l.* 10*s.* for his thatched house; I think 6*l.* the extreme value of it.

3475. Do you happen to know the rent he pays for it?—No, I do not.

3476. Is he a voter?—He is.

3477. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] When speaking of the value, of course you allude to the valuation you made recently?—Yes, I do.

3478. You are not speaking of the value in the year 1832?—In this case I am, for I have this memorandum.

3479. Then you are speaking of the value at the present time?—I am speaking of both in this case. I was at the premises lately to view them, and I have the memorandum in a book that I had at the time of the registry, remarks taken down at the time; for in consequence of my valuing the town, I was obliged to make memorandums for Mr. Welch, in stating the objections to those different pieces.

3480. Who is Mr. Welch?—The barrister employed at the time. From those memorandums I have taken several, and amongst the rest were these, Stephen Mara, Thomas Sheehy and William Gorman.

3481. Was that memorandum made in the year 1832?—Yes.

3482. Is it from finding it in that memorandum that you are led to form the judgment

judgment that they are not worth above 6*l.* a year now?—No, I was recently at the place. Mr. *W^{illiam} Smith.*

3483. Is it from your memorandum or from the view you took recently that you come to the conclusion that they are not worth above 6*l.*?—From both; from the knowledge I had of the place at the former registry, and from recently visiting the place. 14 April 1837.

3484. I am asking you the value at the time when you made the view; the value now; three or four or five years before would not determine what is the present value?—No, the present value is 6*l.*

3485. Then I understand you now to say that your valuation of 6*l.* is the result of your view of the premises just before the registry?—The recent view.

3486. Do you mean to tell me you were not at all influenced by finding a memorandum in your book in the year 1832?—No, I do not know that I was.

3487. You do not think your judgment was at all influenced by that?—No.

3488. Then why did you tell me you were influenced in forming that judgment as well from the view as from the memorandum?—Because I had taken the same view of it at the former period.

3489. Then your judgment was influenced by what you found in your memorandum?—No, I would not say it was, because being at the premises recently, and seeing it in the very same state —

3490. Then if so, your memorandum would not assist you at all in forming your judgment; it either did or did not?—I think, coupled with the recent view, it must have done.

3491. Now then your valuation of 6*l.* was the result as well of the recent view as finding in your memorandum the premises were valued at 6*l.* in the year 1832?—Yes.

3492. Party feeling ran very high in the year 1832, did it not?—It did.

3493. You are a voter yourself?—I am.

3494. You are a freeman?—I voted first as a householder, and since as a freeman.

3495. When were you admitted a freeman?—By referring to the book I can tell.

3496. You voted first as a householder?—I did.

3497. You voted for Mr. Bagwell?—I did.

3498. I believe you were a very staunch valuable friend of Mr. Bagwell?—I was very much so.

3499. And you exerted yourself; did your best?—I did.

3500. Who else valued in the year 1832 besides yourself?—Mr. Higgins and Mr. Shee.

3501. I believe they are also friends of Mr. Bagwell, are they not?—They are. In 1828 was the valuation, and in 1832 the election.

3502. But I am speaking of the memorandum you say you made in the year 1832?—Yes.

3503. I may say there were three valuations for the purpose of the inquiry; I am now on, first, the valuation in 1828 (the official valuation), then the valuation in 1832, for the purpose of making objections to the registry?—Yes.

3504. And thirdly, the view taken by you recently for the purpose of your examination?—Yes.

3505. Now, it so happened in the year 1828 the official valuation was made?—Yes.

3506. In the year 1832, I ask, were you the only person who valued with a view to make objections to the claimants to register?—No, not the only person.

3507. Who were the others?—I think Mr. Shee was one; in fact, I might say there were several, but not examined.

3508. Were you the only one examined?—No, I believe three of us were examined.

3509. Examined by the registering harrister?—Yes.

3510. Well, those three were all in the conservative interest; do you mean to say that any of the persons examined against the votes were in the popular interest?—I do not think they were.

3511. Then this valuation in the year 1832, of which you took memorandums, was it the result of your own view alone in the year 1832, or the combined result of the view taken by those several persons?—The result of my own view.

Mr. W. H. Smith.

14 April 1837.

3512. Do you happen to know whether any other person took memorandums besides you?—I am quite satisfied they did.
3513. Who were they?—I think Mr. Higgins, Mr. Tinsley—
3514. Who is Mr. Tinsley?—He is an architect.
3515. Mr. Higgins was examined the last day?—Yes.
3516. Is Mr. Tinsley here?—No, he is not.
3517. Do you recollect any other person who took memorandums?—Mr. George Graham.
3518. Who is he?—The proprietor of the gas-works.
3519. Is he here?—No, he is not.
3520. There was no summons sent to him?—I believe there was.
3521. Well, was there any one else; do you recollect any other person who took memorandums?—I cannot recollect, but I know there were others.
3522. You are sure there were?—I am sure there were, but I cannot recollect their names.
3523. No others are summoned here to give evidence, I believe, except you and Mr. George Graham and Mr. Higgins?—I do not know of any others summoned.
3524. But you are quite sure there were several others who took memorandums?—Yes, there were; but I cannot recollect who they were.
3525. Now all these persons who were so employed were strong conservatives?—No; I should not say Mr. James Shee is a strong conservative; he is a Roman catholic.
3526. Mr. James Shee; was he one of the persons who valued in the year 1832?—In the 1828 he was; not in 1832.
3527. I am speaking of persons who valued in the year 1832, not the official valuation in 1828. Now, there was no Mr. James Shee making a valuation at that time?—Yes, I think there was.
3528. The same gentlemen?—The same gentleman.
3529. Do you mean to say he valued for the conservatives?—No question of it.
3530. Who did he vote for?—He voted for Mr. Bagwell.
3531. Mr. Bagwell had the interest of all the conservatives, had he not, in the town?—He had.
3532. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Mr. Bagwell was a whig?—He was.
3533. Mr. *Serjeant Bail*.] Who contrived to get the interest of all the conservatives?—He was the best choice they could make. Of two evils they chose the least one.
3534. Do you consider Mr. Bagwell an evil?—At the time, we should have preferred his principles being other than what they were.
3535. Now, Mr. James Shee, he is a Bagwellite, is he not?—Yes.
3536. He was very anxious for the success of Mr. Bagwell?—I think he was.
3537. Was it not rather a strange thing for him to do, being a Roman catholic, to vote for the candidate whom the great body of Roman catholics opposed?—There were several respectable Roman catholics besides him who voted for him.
3538. How many do you suppose?—As far as I recollect, 46.
3539. The entire number of voters, I believe, is about 700, is it not?—I believe it is.
3540. About 46 voted for Mr. Bagwell?—Forty-six Roman catholics.
3541. But they were all his tenants?—Not all.
3542. Did they hold houses in the town?—Some did; I do not think Mr. Shee is a tenant of Mr. Bagwell.
3543. Not an immediate tenant; but I thought the whole town, the fee of it belonged to Mr. Bagwell?—So it does.
3544. He is head landlord?—Yes.
3545. And all the persons who voted for him held either directly under him or indirectly; is it not so?—I believe it is.
3546. And these 46 catholics who came forward and voted for their head landlord in opposition to the great mass of townsmen, you describe as very respectable gentlemen?—Not the entire of them; several were.
3547. They must, of course, have felt a very strong interest for Mr. Bagwell, or they would not have taken that course?—I am satisfied they did.
3548. I am confining your attention to the year 1832; there were you, Mr. Tinsley, the architect, Mr. George Graham, the proprietor of the gas-works, and several

14 April 1837.

several other persons whose names I do not recollect as making the valuation upon which, as you told me, those memorandums were adduced, from which your judgment has been more or less influenced in the recent view, is it not so?—Yes.

3549. Now, all those persons to a man were strong supporters of Mr. Bagwell's interest, were they not?—I believe they were.

3550. *Chairman.*] You have said that these gentlemen who voted for Mr. Bagwell inhabited houses of which Mr. Bagwell was the head landlord?—Yes, I think there were several voted for him who pay him no rent whatever.

3551. But holding premises of which he was the head landlord?—He is the head landlord of the entire town.

3552. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*]—You say, paid him no rent whatever?—But paid to persons deriving under him.

3553. *Chairman.*] Between 200 and 300 persons voted against Mr. Bagwell upon that occasion?—Yes.

3554. Well, they were either his tenants immediately or through the medium of another landlord?—Similarly placed to the others.

3555. Therefore his being the landlord did not seem to affect votes in his favour?—No; for I know some who were his immediate tenants who voted against him.

3556. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] There was a very strong political excitement?—There was.

3557. Perhaps religious also combined?—There might have been that; it was the curse of our town altogether.

3558. Then under those circumstances some of the immediate tenants of Mr. Bagwell were so far excited as to vote against their landlord?—They did so.

3559. *Chairman.*] In point of fact there was a very large majority against him?—There was.

3560. The whole town belonged to him as head landlord?—Yes.

3561. And a great number of the houses belonged to him as the immediate landlord?—Yes.

3562. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Now I believe he is not only the immediate landlord of the whole town, but also the patron of the corporation?—He is.

3563. I believe as patron (I need hardly ask the question) it is he who makes the corporate officers, is it not so?—I do not know that it is he; his grandfather did before him.

3564. But if he chose to interfere; I am speaking of the corporate officers, the mayor, bailiffs, and so on?—It is all under his sanction, no doubt of it.

3565. Now with respect to the freemen and burgesses, I believe in his character of patron he influences all those?—Indeed I should think he does.

3566. You are a freeman?—I am.

3567. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Are you acquainted with the house of Thomas Atkins, in Duckett-street?—I am. His house I consider is of the value of 10*l.*; but the objection to his house was this; he was rejected for nonpayment of rent, and the house was let to a man of the name of Thomas Ryan, who received possession, and afterwards let two rooms to Thomas Atkins. Thomas Atkins, at the ensuing election, voted out of those two rooms as if the house was his; whereas the house was the house of Thomas Ryan.

3568. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Did he not vote for Mr. Bagwell?—I believe at one time he did; I am not certain as to both.

3569. *Sir Robert Ferguson.*] Do you know whether the oath of qualification was put to him; perhaps you were not present when he voted?—I think the oath of qualification was not; I am not positive indeed.

3570. *Mr. Hamilton.*] So that from the circumstance of a man's name being allowed to remain on the registry, notwithstanding his losing his qualification, it occurred, in this instance, that an individual that was actually evicted, voted?—Yes, it did.

3571. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Atkins is no longer a voter?—Yes, he is: he is a lodger now in the house, and voted the last time as if he occupied the entire house.

3572. He is a lodger under a person of the name of Ryan?—Yes.

3573. What did you state the value of Patrick Toole's house to be?—Full 10*l.*, but twice voted for by Roach and Toole.

3574. Are you quite clear upon that as to Roach, because I wish to give you an opportunity of reconsidering it. It is remarkable I have not got his name returned to me at all?—Patrick Roach was the owner of the house.

Mr. William Smith.

14 April 1837.

3575. Are you quite sure he registered?—I am almost positive he did.
3576. How is the house described?—The house is a small house, but a tolerable fair yard, and a snug little garden to it, and two out-offices also built on it.
3577. Do you know how he voted?—I think he voted for Mr. Roanycne.
3578. You are quite certain of that?—Indeed I am certain of it.
3579. And Toole also?—And Toole also.
3580. John Durney and Edward Durney, father and son, are you quite sure that they both voted at the last election?—They did.
3581. You are a freeman?—Yes.
3582. You do not recollect what year you were admitted?—The registry will tell.
3583. No; what year you were admitted freeman, you do not recollect?—No, I do not recollect.
3584. Do you recollect by what right you were admitted?—I do.
3585. What right?—I had two claims; I served seven years to a freeman, and also got married to his daughter.
3586. Had he been a freeman during the entire seven years you served him?—He had, and for a long period before it.
3587. Do you happen to know whether there were not others admitted at the same time with you?—If you mention their names I may recollect.
3588. I find it was in right of marriage that you were admitted?—Yes, by marriage.
3589. And you appear to have been admitted on the 29th of March 1833: it appears also, that about 40, I think, were admitted at the same time; how many were there that were admitted the same day with you?—About 40.
3590. Now this return is a return to an order directing or calling for the names of freemen admitted during the five years immediately preceding the passing of the Reform Bill, and also of those admitted after that period, and up to the day of making the return, together with the days of admission, the rights in which they were respectively admitted, and how many of such freemen were Roman catholics; will you be so good, first, to say how many freemen were admitted for five years preceding the passing of the Reform Bill; what was the date of the passing of the Reform Bill?—I could not tell from this.
3591. It was about July 1832; first of all tell me how many were admitted for the five years antecedent to July 1832?—I could not tell.
3592. But look at the return.
- Chairman.*] He does not know that that is an accurate return.
3593. Assuming that document to be a correct copy of the Parliamentary return, how many freemen appear to have been admitted during the five years antecedent to July 1832, from that document?—None that I can see from this document.
3594. Now, take up the period subsequent to the Reform Bill, and will you be so good as to say how many freemen appear to have been admitted subsequent to the passing of the Reform Bill?—From this paper?
3595. From that paper.—This paper mentions 83.
3596. Will you now say on how many occasions the admissions took place, speaking from that paper only; I believe, with the exception of Mr. Bagwell, who appears to have been admitted in 1832, all the other admissions took place at about one, two or three occasions, and on those only?—There are six occasions.
3597. On one of those occasions 40 were admitted?—Yes.
3598. Well, just see how many were admitted on another of those occasions?—Twenty-three.
3599. Now the rights in which they were severally admitted appear to have been birth, service and marriage, is it not so?—Yes.
3600. And I think one or two by grace special?—Yes.
3601. All the others by birth, servitude or marriage?—Yes.
3602. Now will you look to the column headed, "Religion—Roman-catholics?" how many catholics do you find?—I see but one.
3603. What is his name?—John Farrell.
3604. Do you happen to know who he is?—From this document I do.
3605. But do you know it otherwise; do you know Mr. Bagwell had an agent of the name of Farrell?—I have a recollection of his father; he was dead at the time; this is his son.
3606. Do you know Charles Atcheson?—I do.
3607. Was he admitted at the same time with you?—I could not tell you.

3608. Do you know in what right he was admitted?—No, I do not.
3609. Do you know James Burke?—I do.
3610. Well, what trade is he?—He is a woollen-draper.
3611. Do you know to whom he served his time?—To a Mr. Nolan.
3612. And do you happen to know whether he was a regularly indentured apprentice to Nolan?—I do not; nor yet whether Mr. Nolan was a freeman even.
3613. Now I wish to call your attention to a period antecedent to the passing of the Reform Bill (antecedent to July 1832); had you ever heard, or had you ever known any person admitted as a freeman in right of marriage antecedent to the passing of the Reform Bill; first of all, how long have you lived in Clonmel?—For 32 years.
3614. Had you, in a single instance, known a person admitted as a freeman of the corporation of Clonmel in right of marriage?—I know very little about the corporation in any shape.
3615. I only ask you whether you had known a single instance?—I do not know of it; they might have been admitted; I could not tell under what circumstances they were admitted; I never knew one halfpennyworth about the corporation.
3616. But you never heard of the admission of any one person in right of marriage antecedent to the passing of the Reform Bill?—No.
3617. Mr. Hagg.] Have you any knowledge, one way or the other, as to the fact whether persons had or had not been admitted by reason of marriage?—I knew nothing whatever of the corporation up to the time I was admitted myself.
3618. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did you know Mr. Chater, the late mayor?—I did.
3619. I believe Mr. Chater had been mayor many years?—He had.
3620. The practice is to elect a mayor once a year, is it not?—It is.
3621. But the same person may be elected any number of times?—Yes.
3622. And accordingly Mr. Chater was many years mayor?—He was.
3623. Now do you recollect the examination that took place by the Commissioners of Corporation Inquiry in Clonmel in the year 1833?—No, I never attended it at all.
3624. I believe there are many respectable people in trade in Clonmel, who have never been admitted to their freedom?—There are.
- 3624*. Although they applied for it?—There have not been many applied, but some have.
3625. And have not been admitted?—No.
3626. Well now, you were admitted, it appears by the return, in right of marriage?—Yes.
3627. Now you must have known something about the corporation of Clonmel at that time?—Indeed, very little.
3628. You applied for your freedom?—I did.
3629. How came you to apply for your freedom in the month of March 1833, and to have lived so many years without your freedom?—The principal reason why I did it was to enable my son to have a vote; that was the only inducement I had for doing it. There was no other emolument whatever derived from it that I know of.
3630. There is the right to vote; you have the right to vote, and the right of giving a vote to your son?—Yes.
3631. You propagate voters?—That is the motive I had for being registered as a freeman.
3632. Well, now it appears that a good many others also seem to have been influenced by some such motive; in fact, it was to increase the number of votes?—Indeed it was.
3633. Are you aware that by the provisions of the Reform Act there is an end put, as far as voting is concerned, to freemen by special favour?—I am aware of that.
3634. Now accordingly I have called your attention to it, I believe, with the exception of one or two here in this return, (three,) there are but three persons out of 83 who were admitted by grace special?—I believe not.
3635. Who are these gentlemen; who is the Rev. James P. Rhodes?—He is the rector of the parish.
3636. But inasmuch as the Reform Bill intervened, he could not vote?—No.
3637. Who is Mr. Richard Burgess?—A medical doctor.
3638. He does not vote either?—No.

Mr. William Smith.

14 April 1837.

3639. How long has he lived in the town; Mr. Burgess?—I think about two or three-and-twenty years.
3640. He is a medical doctor?—Yes.
3641. Of course he could not serve his time to any trade which entitled him to claim his right to vote?—No, he did not serve his apprenticeship in Clonmel.
3642. In the same manner the Rev. Mr. Rhodes, being a clergyman, he could have no ground of admission?—No.
3643. He must have come in by special favour, if at all; who is Mr. Benjamin B. Bradshaw?—The late mayor of the town.
3644. *Chairman.*] Is Mr. Rhodes a registered voter under another qualification?—He is.
3645. Then he is a voter, though not as a burgess?—Yes.
3646. Now, is Mr. Burgess a voter?—No, I do not think he is; he lives in the house of his brother-in-law.
3647. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now, Benjamin B. Bradshaw; is that the old gentleman who was the mayor a few months ago?—Yes.
3648. He was not in any trade?—No.
3649. Then he had no claim?—No.
3650. He could not be admitted at all unless by special favour?—No.
3651. And he appears to have been admitted in 1835; I believe he became mayor about that time?—Yes.
3652. Probably he was admitted for the purpose of enabling him to become mayor?—It is very probable. I cannot answer from my own knowledge as to that.
3653. Then, with the exception of those three persons, no person appears to have been admitted, during the period comprised in this return, by special favour, except those three?—No; it appears so by that return; I am speaking from that return now.
3654. You mentioned you were married to the daughter of a freeman?—Yes.
3655. What is your father-in-law's name?—Stephen Going.
3656. When was he admitted?—Long before I went to serve my apprenticeship.
3657. You do not know in what right he was admitted?—No, I do not, further than what he has told me himself. Long previous to my ever knowing I was to become an apprentice of his, he had claimed his freedom, and was refused it by the present Mr. Bagwell's grandfather.
3658. That is what he told you?—Yes; he claimed his freedom in right of apprenticeship, serving seven years.
3659. Upon your admission as a freeman, did you have what is called a cocket?—I did.
3660. Have you got that now in your possession?—Not about me; I have it home.
3661. What fee did you pay?—I think it was a guinea that I paid for the stamp.
3662. What fee?—For the filling it up?
3663. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Yes.—None whatever.
3664. Did not you pay the town clerk a fee?—No; he did not charge me. Several have paid; but he and I had an account. However, he made me no charge.
3665. Then he admitted you by grace special?—No; that was for the filling up of the cocket; he made no charge for that, but I paid a guinea for the stamp duty.
3666. *Chairman.*] You have stated that Mr. Bagwell appoints all the corporate officers, have you not?—So far as my knowledge leads me to know.
3667. When you say that, you mean that his influence is such, in the corporation, as to enable him to recommend individuals, and that that recommendation is attended to; that is what you mean, I suppose; is it not?—I should think his recommendation would be a good deal attended to.
3668. But is it simply by his possessing the property, or as lord of the manor, that he appoints these officers; is there any special right, or is it by the influence he exercises among the members of the corporation?—I am unable to give any information respecting the way they are appointed. I know very little about the corporation business.

3669. Mr. Hogg.] You yourself have no knowledge of whether Mr. Bagwell can or cannot appoint officers?—No, I have no knowledge. Mr. William Smith.
3670. One way or the other?—No, only I judge his influence would be a great deal in the appointment. 14 April 1837.
3671. That is your conjecture without any knowledge?—Mere conjecture.
3672. Or without any adequate means of knowledge?—Yes.
3673. Mr. Hamilton.] You stated from the document which the honourable Member for Clonsilla handed you, a number of freemen had been admitted since the passing of the Reform Act; are you aware the Reform Act expressly recognised the rights of freemen?—I have heard so, for there were several appeals at the registry. The presiding barrister refused to register a number of freemen; they all appealed, and the going judge of the next assizes had them all registered.
3674. Then I presume the freemen were desirous of availing themselves of the first opportunity after the passing of the Reform Act to convert their freedom into a franchise?—Yes.
3675. You stated also you took out your own freedom with a view to ensure the right of franchise to your son?—Yes.
3676. The freemen, therefore, value their rights, and are desirous of handing them down to their posterity?—Just so; they are.
3677. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You were asked about Mr. Bagwell being able to appoint corporate officers, and I asked you as to his power to appoint freemen, at least his exercising the power of appointing freemen, whatever it may be, whether a direct exercise or mere influence; in point of fact, is there any instance of a person appointed a freeman or a corporate officer, who was not in Mr. Bagwell's interest; do you know any such case as that?—Yes, I do, I know one case.
3678. Of a freeman?—Yes, that occurred at the last registry, Mr. Lonargan.
3679. Do you know when he was admitted a freeman?—Very recently.
3680. Chairman.] Is he a solicitor?—Yes.
3681. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You speak of him, not the father?—Him, not the father.
3682. When was he admitted; recently?—Within a few months; his name is Stephen.
3683. You say he is not in Mr. Bagwell's interest?—No.
3684. He was admitted as late as last June?—I believe so.
3685. The 24th of June 1836, according to this return?—About that period.
3686. That is since the last election?—Yes.
3687. When Mr. Bagwell did not stand?—Yes, he was admitted in right of servitude.
3688. Now, I ask you whether you ever knew a person admitted freeman who was not in Mr. Bagwell's interest, and you will confine your answer to a period antecedent to the last election?—I do not know, unless I look at the list again. Every one of them was in Mr. Bagwell's interest, with the exception of Mr. Stephen Lonargan; every one that I can see.
3689. Chairman.] Which return do you mean?—The official return.
3690. Every one except Mr. Stephen Lonargan?—Yes.
3691. And he was admitted as late as the 24th of June 1836?—Yes, by virtue of servitude. I should like to correct what I stated a few minutes ago with respect to Mr. Bagwell's having the entire control; it now occurs to my memory that the burgesses are all summoned for a certain day, when there are claims for admission.
3692. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Are you a burgess?—No, I am not. I know I was obliged to wait myself when I applied for my freedom, and to give a notice to that effect, stating in what right I claimed, and that a meeting of burgesses took place within a certain period afterwards on that occasion.
3693. Sir Robert Ferguson.] Was any examination of your claim gone into at the time you were admitted?—Yes; I was obliged to state upon what ground I made the application.
3694. Did you state that upon oath?—No.
3695. Of course they had the power of referring to the books to see whether your statement was correct?—Yes.
3696. As to your master being a freeman, or as to your father-in-law being a freeman?—Yes.
3697. Did they do so in your presence?—No.

Mr. William Smith.

14 April 1837.

3698. Mr. Hogg.] Did you ever vote as a freeman?—I did; the last time I voted was as a freeman.

3699. Chairman.] What year was that in?—1835.

3700. Mr. Hogg.] Was any objection taken to you by any party when you offered yourself or registry, upon the occasion of your being registered as a freeman?—None whatever.

3701. Chairman.] Were there any persons objected to when you were registered as a freeman?—There were several.

3702. Which revising barrister admitted you?—Mr. Hobson admitted me as a freeman.

3703. Mr. Hogg.] It was matter of notoriety in Clonmel, the ground upon which you were admitted a freeman?—Quite so.

3704. Sir Robert Ferguson.] Upon what ground were those objected to that were objected to?—One was objected to in consequence of his not having any indentures; serving seven years to his father without indentures. He was objected to, and the objection held good, and he was not registered.

3705. Did he appeal?—I am not positive of that.

3706. Do you remember whether any other objection was taken than that?—I cannot call to memory now.

3707. Then there was an examination, at the time of the registration, into the right by which they were admitted to their freedom?—There was.

3708. Mr. Hogg.] The party spirit would have rendered the parties pretty acute and sharp in detecting any informality?—Decidedly; attending all registrations there were persons from the liberal side, and persons from the conservative side, watching each other.

3709. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You were admitted by Mr. Hobson?—Yes.

3710. You do not recollect whether there was any formal objection made to your admission or not?—There was none.

3711. Do you recollect the objection made to the admission of other freemen besides the one you have specified?—Not before Mr. Hobson, as far as I recollect.

3712. Were you present during the entire of that registry?—Not at all.

3713. Were you present when the objection was made that no person was entitled in respect of the coporation of Clonmel to the right to freedom on the ground of birth, servitude or marriage; were you present when that objection was made?—No, I was not.

3714. You did not hear that objection made?—I did not.

3715. Then you did not hear that the barrister, Mr. Hobson, had overruled the objection, stating he as registering barrister could not go into it?—Where did it take place? because it was not in Clonmel that I was registered; I went over to Cashel to the quarter sessions to be registered there.

3716. Will you compare the return made under the orders of this Committee, of the freemen of Clonmel, with the other paper, and state what difference exists? The first document I put into your hand purported to be a copy of a return made to the House of Commons under the order of 1835, of the freemen of Clonmel; the second document is the return made to this Committee of the number of freemen in Clonmel at present. Now the first document was the one in respect of which I have been already examining you; I put my questions to you, assuming that to be a correct copy. I now hand you the original return laid before this Committee, and I ask you whether the two correspond, and if not, in what respect do they differ?—There are some names appearing in the paper you gave me which do not appear in the other one.

3717. How many?—I find 14 in your paper that are not in the other.

3718. Are there not some in the other paper which are not in the paper I gave you?—Yes; I observe five.

3719. In any other respect do you observe any discrepancy?—I do not observe Mr. Benjamin B. Bradshaw by grace special. I do not observe that in the Committee's Report.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.] He is dead.

3720. Chairman.] As far as a cursory examination will enable you to state, are those the only discrepancies that appear?—Those are all that I can perceive.

3721. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You were examined as a witness before the Committee in the year 1833, who tried the election for the borough of Clonmel?—Yes; I was examined then.

3722. Your examination was pretty much to the effect of what has occurred here; you were examined to prove that persons were registered whose premises were not of sufficient value?—Yes.

3723. You were actually on Mr. Bagwell's committee?—I was.

3724. One of his committee?—I was.

3725. I believe you were the gentleman who instructed Mr. Welch, the barrister, to appear for the conservative party?—I did instruct him; I was not the principal person that instructed him, but I did instruct him.

3726. You gave him instructions?—I did.

3727. And, in point of fact, Mr. Welch did proceed to challenge several of the votes?—He did, to cross-examine respecting them.

3728. To impugn the votes?—Yes.

3729. Or rather to impugn the right of registry?—Yes.

3730. And there was no obstacle thrown in his way; the barrister allowed him?—He did allow him.

3731. He had full play?—Yes. The only objection Mr. Welch made when I went in was, he said there was no use producing me as a witness; the barrister would register every person that came before him.

3732. This Mr. Welch told you?—Yes.

3733. Mr. Welch failed in his objections?—He told me the barrister would not attend to the evidence; that he would register every one who would swear his place was worth 10*l.* a year.

3734. Do you mean to say he said would register, or that he would not receive evidence?—That he would not receive evidence.

3735. Mr. Welch was very zealous for his clients, the conservatives?—Of course.

3736. And he did all that counsel could do to carry the point for them?—He did, in cross-examination.

3737. Did he offer any evidence?—Yes, there was evidence offered.

3738. And examination also?—Yes, three persons examined.

3739. In fact, then, he resorted to every expedient that a professional man could fairly resort to for the purpose of effecting his object; he cross-examined witnesses and examined witnesses; is not that so?—I think he ought to have examined more witnesses.

3740. Then you and he differed as to the mode of conducting it?—He thought himself there was no use in producing witnesses.

3741. Then your opinion was, if he had examined more witnesses, that the barrister would have relented; is it not so?—No; I think it was the duty of Mr. Welch to produce more witnesses.

3742. Not, if he could not produce any effect by doing so; not if he could not change the mind of the barrister?—Just so; his impression was, that he could not.

3743. And your impression was that he could?—No, I won't say that, but I think he should have examined witnesses in several other cases, where he rested on the cross-examination.

3744. Was not that with a view to change the barrister's mind?—Yes.

3745. Then your impression is, if Mr. Welch had examined witnesses in the cases to which you last alluded, the barrister's mind might have been changed?—I think it might.

3746. Accordingly, it was by the misconduct, I don't mean to use the term offensively, but it was by the mode in which the case was conducted, that the objections, you think, in some instances, failed?—No; I think the objections failed in consequence of the barrister believing the claimants. He stated, himself, that he considered the claimants to be the best judges of the value of their own premises.

3747. Have you not told me, if witnesses had been examined in particular cases, you think the barrister would have changed his mind?—I think it is probable he would.

3748. And, therefore, it was by reason of the mode in which the case was conducted, the non-examination of witnesses in those cases, that in your opinion the votes were allowed?—Yes, it was.

3749. Then I need hardly ask you, if that is the case, whether you can impute it as matter of blame to the registering barrister, that those witnesses were not examined?—Certainly not.

3750. Then the registering barrister, according to your apprehension, after the answer you have given me, was disposed to do what he considered fair, on the

Mr. William Smith.

24 April 1837.

evidence before him; have you any doubt of that? You have stated, if witnesses had been examined in the particular cases you alluded to, the barrister's mind was open to conviction,—would have been altered with respect to the claims. Now, if that be so, can you hesitate to say whether, in your opinion, the barrister was disposed to act fairly and dispassionately on the evidence brought before him, respecting these votes?—In my opinion he was not.

3751. And yet your opinion is, that he would have yielded to the evidence of the witnesses, if the witnesses had been examined?—In some cases he might; for instance, in the case of the butcher; that was such a case of notoriety, that he did receive evidence in that case, and rejected the vote.

3752. He might, you say?—Yes.

3753. But did I understand you rightly to say, your reason for considering Mr. Welch not to have been acting properly was, that you were of opinion if he had examined witnesses in the particular cases to which you alluded, the barrister would have pronounced a different judgment?—Mr. Welch would have examined witnesses, but that he could not procure them. They would not go forward.

3754. Then, when you said, just now, that you blamed Mr. Welch for not having examined witnesses, from your last answer am I to collect you blame the witnesses, and not Mr. Welch, for not coming forward?—I think if Mr. Welch had called for the witnesses, in many cases, such cases of notoriety as the butcher's case, that the barrister would have received the evidence.

3755. Would the witnesses have come forward?—I would not have come forward myself, I will answer for it.

3756. Do I understand you, then, as blaming Mr. Welch for not examining witnesses, or blaming the witnesses for not coming forward to be examined?—Indeed, I could not blame the witnesses for not coming forward.

3757. Then was it Mr. Welch's fault if they did not come forward?—Mr. Welch certainly stated it was no use producing witnesses; he almost despaired producing witnesses.

3758. Now, I ask you the same question again, and give me an answer one way or the other; do you blame Mr. Welch, then, for not having examined witnesses upon those occasions to which you have been alluding, or do you blame the witnesses, because they would not come forward?—Indeed, I don't blame Mr. Welch in those cases, for he despaired of the barrister receiving the evidence of any person but the claimants to register.

3759. Do you mean to say, he despaired of the barrister's receiving any evidence brought before him?—Or crediting the evidence of the witnesses.

3760. Then, when you said received, you meant credited?—Yes, in preference to the man's own evidence that the place was worth 10 £.

3761. But you did not despair of it, because you say, if witnesses had been examined in those particular cases, you think the barrister's mind would have been changed?—Yes; such a case as I gave in point this moment.

3762. So that, in that way, you differed in judgment from Mr. Welch, as to the mode of conducting the case?—I don't think I did differ with him.

3763. But you say, in your opinion, if witnesses had been examined, the barrister's mind would have been changed; but Mr. Welch's opinion was that it would not?—But Mr. Welch had not witnesses to produce at this period, because I, who was to be examined as a witness, declined to go forward.

3764. Then it comes to this, that you declined coming forward?—I did.

3765. Did you not tell me, if the witnesses had come and been examined, that the barrister's mind would have been changed?—No; because the barrister rejected my evidence altogether, with two or three others.

3766. Then, if you had come forward, your impression is, the barrister's mind would not have been changed?—I do not think it would.

3767. Did you not tell me just now, two or three times, your impression was, if Mr. Welch had examined witnesses in particular cases, the barrister's mind would have been changed; was that your impression, and was that the answer you gave me?—I think I said it might have been changed.

3768. Did you not tell me before that, in more than one instance, your impression was, it would have been changed?—It is probable I did.

3769. Which do you wish to abide by?—I say it might have been changed.

3770. Mr. Lefroy.] Were you present in any instance in which witnesses had been examined as to under-value, and the barrister acted against their evidence upon the oath of the claimant, as to the property being to him worth so much?—

No;

No; I was not present, unless at the examination of myself; I was not present at the examination of the other witnesses; one or two of them had been previously examined, and I had been attending to my business.

3771. But, upon your own examination, did he act against your testimony, upon the oath of the parties?—He did.

3772. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Your reason for declining to come forward then was, that the barrister attached no weight to your evidence when you gave it?—Precisely so.

3773. As compared with the evidence of the voter himself, with regard to the value of his own premises?—Yes.

3774. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] You deduce that from the circumstance of his not having done so in the one particular case in which you were examined?—Yes.

3775. *Chairman*.] What was the case in which you were examined?—I think it was in the case of William Carey, of Dispensary-street.

3776. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] I believe, under the Reform Act, there is no power of compelling witnesses to attend?—I have heard, since, there was not at that time. I thought there was, and I received a summons to attend.

3777. Now, being an active partisan of Bagwell's, did you not find a practical inconvenience from witnesses and evidence not having been tendered to Mr. Guthrie at the time of the registration of those voters?—The difficulty was such that I was quite satisfied no respectable person would go forward.

3778. Do you know upon what ground the petition against Mr. Rosayne, presented by Mr. Bagwell, failed?—I think it was owing to objections not being raised before the revising barrister.

3779. Well, now, did those objections go to the mere fact of objections not having been raised, but no evidence having been tendered in support of those objections?—As far as I recollect, the decision of the Committee was this, that they would go into no cases where evidence had not been tendered to reject the claimant before the presiding barrister.

3780. Would not that decision, therefore, cause you to regret that evidence had not been tendered in these cases?—It would.

3781. And was not that a practical inconvenience arising out of the non-tendering of the evidence?—It was.

3782. Did you and other witnesses, that were in the first instance asked to attend, decline further attendance, because your evidence appeared to be of no value whatever?—Every one.

3783. I mean of no value as far as inducing Mr. Guthrie to decide upon the value of the house?—Yes; every one of us declined. We were repeatedly called on afterwards, and we declined going.

3784. But still you now regret, as well for the reason I have stated, as also for the other reasons you have stated, that such evidence was not adduced?—Yes.

3785. And, moreover, do you think that, if such evidence had been adduced, Mr. Guthrie would have been still adhering to his rule, to admit all claimants upon their own oath, and without regard to such evidence as had been adduced?—Yes; that was the impression upon my mind.

3786. Is that impression still upon your mind?—Indeed it is, and has been ever since.

3787. Do you mean to say Mr. Guthrie laid down any such a rule as that, that he would not receive, or, if he received, he would not attend to any evidence in opposition to the oath of the party himself?—I do not say he laid down any such rule.

3788. Mr. *Lefroy*.] Did he act upon that?—He acted upon that, as far as I can recollect.

3789. Mr. *Hogg*.] With reference to what you said as to your entertaining an opinion different from the gentleman employed by the conservative party, as to calling evidence, am I right in supposing you to have said that it is your opinion that evidence ought to be adduced, in order to make the case full and complete; whether the impression on your mind was, that the revising barrister would or not act upon it?—That was the impression upon my mind, that the evidence should be tendered, whether he would reject it or not; it was afterwards that I saw the great want of his having the persons objected to at the period.

3790. Then, in forming that opinion, were you influenced by what you have stated, the propriety of making the case full, whether the barrister would or not act upon it; or were you influenced by a belief that, if such evidence had been adduced, the

Mr. William Smith.

14 April 1837.

barrister would have acted upon it, and would have rejected the vote, notwithstanding the oath of the claimant?—By the former case.

3791. Mr. Serjeant *Bail*.] Then you were not at all influenced in your desire to have witnesses examined by the hope, the expectation or the belief that the barrister might change his mind?—Indeed I would have been very desirous that the barrister should have changed his mind from producing evidence.

3792. *Chairman*.] Were you influenced in your wish to have had this evidence given before the barrister by a feeling that that evidence would have changed the opinion of the barrister in cases of undervalue, or were you influenced by the feeling that it would have been important to have had the evidence fully and fairly before the Committee?—I labour under the impression that it would be very well to have the evidence as full as possible, notwithstanding the rejection of the barrister; but I do not think it would have changed the opinion of the barrister.

3793. Mr. Serjeant *Bail*.] Then you were not at all influenced in your desire to have witnesses examined by the hope that the barrister might change his mind?—I was not, for I had no hope of the barrister changing his mind.

3794. Or expectation or belief?—Or expectation or belief.

3795. You say that distinctly?—I do.

3796. And of course you were not influenced at all in wishing Mr. Welch to have examined witnesses by any such expectation, hope or belief?—No, not after the rejection of the three first witnesses.

3797. At any time?—I cannot state what occurred before I went in.

3798. I am speaking of the particular cases to which you have been alluding, in which you stated your wish that Mr. Welch had examined witnesses: I ask you again, whether you were at all influenced in forming that wish from any expectation, hope or belief that if witnesses had been examined the barrister might have changed his mind?—No, I was not.

3799. Not in the least?—No; for I did not expect he would.

3800. Or believe he would?—Indeed I did not.

3801. You had no hope; you despaired?—I did, and so did Mr. Welch.

3802. Mr. *Hemiltow*.] Had you not grounds for supposing the barrister would not change his mind, from his own declaration that he conceived the men were the best judges of the value of their own premises?—Yes.

3803. And that under circumstances in which there was no question with respect to the facts of the case; the facts of the case being not only proved by him, but admitted by the claimant himself, namely, that the premises were not worth 10*l.* intrinsically, but they were worth 10*l.* to him?—Yes.

3804. *Chairman*.] In fact, it was the principle he laid down, and not the facts that the difference of opinion existed upon?—Yes, it was.

3805. He took a different criterion of value to what you did?—He took what the man swore to him to be the value; what they were worth to him individually to be the value.

3806. As arising from his profession, or occupation, or calling, or whatever it may be?—Yes.

3807. And you took the proper criterion of value to be what the thing was worth in the market, if offered by the party to be let to-morrow?—Yes, if offered to be let to-morrow, for instance.

3808. Mr. *Hogg*.] Was the revising barrister influenced by the rent paid by the claimant for the premises?—No; I do not think he was.

3809. That is to say, if the claimant paid only 6*l.* or 7*l.* he would register, if he swore that the premises to him were worth 10*l.*?—He would register him if he swore the premises to be worth to him 10*l.*

3810. Although the rent was only 6*l.* or 7*l.*?—Or 3*l.*

3811. Mr. Serjeant *Bail*.] And your impression is that the barrister ought not to have registered any man whose premises would not, as you call it, let for 10*l.* in the market?—Yes.

3812. So that no matter what profitable use might be made of the premises by the claimant; for instance, letting lodgings, making 20*l.* a year by lodgings; your impression is, that unless that house would let in the market, as you call it, for 10*l.* a year, he ought not to be registered?—That is my impression.

3813. You were one of the four witnesses examined before the Parliamentary Committee?—Yes.

3814. Who was the other valuator that was examined with you?—Joseph Higgins.

3815. Now

3815. Now I wish to ask you a few questions as to the principle upon which Mr. Guthrie proceeded; you have already stated he was in the habit of taking the oath of the claimant?—Yes.

3816. I ask you now, with reference to the evidence you gave before the Election Committee in 1833, what you stated to be Mr. Guthrie's principle of registering at that time?—As far as I can recollect, it was this: that he took the oath of the claimant in preference to any evidence tendered at the period of his registry.

3817. That is to say (am I right in this?) that in certain instances he believed the claimant, and did not believe the evidence against the claimant?—Yes.

3818. That was his practice; I want to ask you about his principle; did he lay down this principle; did you state in your evidence in 1833, before the Parliamentary Committee, what principle he proceeded upon; you see the distinction between practice and principle?—I do not recollect I did state.

3819. Did you state this, or anything to this effect, namely, that Mr. Guthrie's principle was to take the oath of the claimant, unless it was contradicted by other evidence?—I think it is very likely I did state that.

3820. Now, then, is that your belief at present?—Indeed it is. I think Mr. Guthrie would have received evidence if tendered to him.

3821. It was tendered in some instances?—Yes, and he received it; he did in the case of the butcher.

3822. Is it your recollection that he expressed his readiness to receive evidence contradicting the oath of the party?—I do not recollect that I stated anything of his readiness.

3823. That he expressed his readiness to receive any evidence that should be produced in contradiction of the claim of the party?—I do not recollect I stated that.

3824. Do you now recollect whether he did or not in your presence?—No, I do not. I do not recollect that he ever did state his readiness to hear evidence if tendered to him.

3825. And you do not recollect whether you ever said so or not, on the occasion I allude to?—No, I do not. I might or might not.

3826. Were you present when the other witnesses were examined at that period?—No, I was not.

3827. Mr. *Lefroy*.] Was not the oath of the party as to value in reference to a different view of the subject from the oath of the witnesses produced on the other side?—It was quite different.

3828. The oath of the party as to the value was what the thing was worth to himself?—Yes, from his trade or occupation.

3829. But the oath of the witnesses produced was as to the intrinsic value of the thing?—Exactly so.

3830. And, therefore, although witnesses might have been produced before Mr. Guthrie as to the intrinsic value, and although he might have believed them, that would not necessarily have led to his rejection of the vote, if the man swore it was worth to him 10 l.?—It would not.

3831. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] When you say the oath of the claimant was believed as to the value of the premises to him, of course you confine that observation to certain claimants?—To certain claimants.

3832. And, I rather think, you have specified in your evidence the instances in which you recollect that to have occurred?—Yes.

3833. In those instances where the claimant swore they were worth to him 10 l. the harrister registered the vote?—Yes, he did.

3834. Do you now recollect whether, in those instances you have specified in your evidence, contradictory evidence was called or not; can you mention any one case respecting which you have given evidence to-day or yesterday, in which the claimant swore to the premises being worth to him 10 l., although they were not intrinsically worth that; can you state any one instance of any evidence called to defeat the claim?—I know there was evidence, but I was not present at the evidence.

3835. Can you mention any one case in which you know there was evidence?—I know there was evidence given by Mr. Legge, in the case of a man of the name of Connors.

3836. Have you given any evidence with respect to Connors?—No, I have not.

3837. I am asking you in any case in which you have given evidence?—Do you

Mr. William Smith,

14 April 1837.

you mean before the Committee, or before the revising barrister? because I gave evidence but in one case before the revising barrister.

3838. You have been telling us as to the principle upon which Mr. Guhrig registered, and in answer to the Hon. Member for Dublin, you have stated that the claimants swore to the value to them of the premises?—Yes.

3839. But not the intrinsic value?—No.

3840. Whereas the evidence was as to intrinsic value, not as to value to the claimant? I began by asking you, do you mean to say that was always the case, or only in particular cases; your answer was, in particular cases.—In particular cases; where there was a question as to the value of the premises, where they did not come up to 10*l.*; not in cases where the value was 40*l.*, 50*l.*, 70*l.*, 80*l.* or 100*l.*

3841. And therefore it was in those cases in which the intrinsic value did not amount to 10*l.*?—Yes.

3842. You have specified several in which, in your judgment, the intrinsic value was under 10*l.*?—Yes.

3843. Can you mention any one case in which evidence was actually called, and witnesses actually examined to disprove the claim?—No, I cannot, because I went but once. I would not go afterwards at all. But there were four very respectable men examined besides me, and they treated it in the very same manner, and they would not go forward again.

3844. Mr. *Lefroy*.] In the instance in which you went forward, was not that an instance in which witnesses had been examined as to the intrinsic value, against the claim, the party swearing to the value to himself?—I was the only witness examined in that case.

3845. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] What is the name of the case?—I think, William Carey, of Dispensary-street.

3846. Is he a voter now?—He is dead.

3847. Mr. *Hogg*.] Do you recollect what you stated to be the marketable value of the premises on that occasion, in that particular case?—I think it was 8*l.*

3848. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Are there within your knowledge any persons registered who are mere occasional lodgers?—Yes, there are.

3849. Mr. *Hogg*.] With your local knowledge of Clonsilla, are you able to tell me how many persons you believe to have been registered as voters by the revising barrister, the marketable value of whose premises is under 10*l.*?—I think there were from 60 to 80.

3850. The whole constituency being how many?—I believe at the first election it was somewhere about 500.

3851. Mr. *Lefroy*.] You spoke of the reluctance of witnesses to come forward; do you conceive that if there were a compulsory process to oblige them to attend, that witnesses would avoid coming forward then, or would they yield obedience to such compulsory summonses?—I think they would yield obedience to such compulsory summonses.

3852. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] You say there were from 60 to 80 whose premises, in your judgment, were under the marketable value of 10*l.*; now, how many of those are now on the register, as well as you can calculate?—I think there are very near 60.

3853. Then there is near the minimum number registered, according to your judgment?—Yes, under value.

3854-55. Have there not been deaths since, or removals?—There have.

3856. Then of course if there have been deaths and removals there are not 60?—But there are others since, which I consider under value also; but how can the present barristers, or any barrister, ascertain the value of them when they go forward and swear it?

3857. Then, in your judgment, some of them have been registered both by Mr. Hobson and Mr. Honbey?—Very few indeed.

3858. Were they opposed?—So far as cross-examination went; but no witnesses tendered.

3859. Why were no witnesses tendered to Hobson and Honbey?—For one of the best reasons that can be, that no person was disposed to go forward.

3860. You state, then, that no person could be disposed to go forward to disprove the allegation of the claimants that their premises were worth 10*l.*?—I think not, without they were compelled to go forward.

3861. Would you have any objection to go forward?—I would have an objection,

tion, because it is such an unthankful office to disprove what a man proves on oath his premises to be worth.

3862. Was it not at least as unthankful an office when you did go forward?—I shoud under the impression then that I was obliged to go forward, or I would not have done it, in consequence of receiving the summons that I did; I thought there was even a penalty attached; and as soon as I ascertained there was no penalty attached to that, I certainly declined going forward.

3863. Now when you said from 60 to 80, have you made a calculation for the purpose of being prepared to state on the present occasion what number there were?—I have made a calculation of perhaps 20 or 30 from my own knowledge; that is from being in the premises; but there is a number I know, from my local knowledge of the town, and though I have not been in them, I could safely say they are not of the value of 10 *l*.

3864. Am I right in saying it is all conjecture with you; you have not been in the premises?—In some I have.

3865. But as to the remainder, namely, 40, you have not been in them?—No, but other persons have.

3866. What is your own impression?—My own impression is, from being on the premises, over 20 I am satisfied; I believe I have given evidence in over 20 cases.

3867. How many can you speak of from actual knowledge; in every case which you have given evidence of, have you spoken from actual knowledge?—I have.

3868. On the premises?—On the premises; I was on the premises in every case I gave evidence in.

3869. And as to the others, to make up 60, you speak only from conjecture?—From my general knowledge of the town; I could not say from being in them, but from passing by so repeatedly and seeing the state they are in.

3870. Then do not you think that others, equally competent to judge of the value of houses as yourself, may have formed a different estimate?—Indeed they may.

3871. Then it is a good deal matter of conjecture after all?—Yes, it is.

3872. And if some two or three competent persons differed with you, who were not more disposed than yourself, but quite as well disposed, to act as fairly as you, if they differ in opinion with you perhaps you might be disposed to distrust your own judgment?—Where it came to 8 *l*. or 8 *l*. 10 *s*. I would certainly; but in cases where the value could be but 3 *l*., no respectable man will come forward and swear that it is worth 10 *l*.

3873. When you go as near as 8 *l*. 10 *s*., you would be disposed to think, as a fair man, the judgment of others, particularly if there were more than one, ought perhaps to supersede yours?—Yes.

3874. *Chairman*.] You have formed your opinion by reference to the landlord's book in many cases?—I have.

3875. *Mr. Serjeant Ball*.] You have specified where you have done that in your evidence, have not you?—I have.

3876. *Chairman*.] Universally, have you?—In some cases I could not tell the rent at all.

3877. But your recollection is, whenever you did resort to the landlord's book or otherwise to ascertain the rent, you have stated it in your evidence?—There were, perhaps, two or three cases where I did not state the rent, not exactly recollecting it, or not having taken it down.

3878. *Mr. Hamilton*.] Are you acquainted with James O'Flanagan, of White's-lane?—Yes.

3879. Can you state the nature of his occupation?—A printer.

3880. Can you state the nature of his occupation of the house?—He has a room in which he has a printing-press, and has a little bedroom. I went, some time since, to view his premises, and he thought it was for the purpose of having the watch and lamp taken off his premises, and he said, "Of course," says he, "you are quite aware I have only part of the house, and it is too bad to have the house put down in my name; I pay but" (I think it was) "14 *d*. a week," he told me; and we examined the house, looked at it, and we put it down at 5 *l*. the entire house, as he was but a lodger; and up to this day he is but a lodger.

3881. So that, in point of fact, he is only a weekly lodger?—A weekly lodger, paying 1 *s*. 2 *d*. a week, as near as I can recollect; I think it was 1 *s*. 2 *d*. a week that he told me.

3882. *Mr. Serjeant Ball*.] Was that the case at the time he registered?—Yes.

3883. Why was not an objection made?—He was cross-examined as to the nature

Mr. William Smith.
14 April 1897.

nature of his holding, and he swore it to be worth to him, from his printing in the place (he was a very small printer and a very poor man), and he stated it was worth to him more than 10 l. a year.

3884. Was the objection taken that he was only an occasional lodger, but not the owner?—I cannot tell with respect to that, because I know a cross-examination took place, and he stated it to be worth 10 l. a year.

3885. Was the objection made that he was only a lodger?—I cannot say, from my own knowledge, that the objection was made; but in all those cases there were written instructions given to Mr. Welch, stating who the parties were, and what part of the house they occupied.

3886. Then you cannot say whether the objection was made or not?—No.

3887. Mr. Hamilton.] Who was his landlord, do you know?—No, I do not know his landlord.

3888. Chairman.] Is there any number in White-street?—I think not.

3889. Mr. Hamilton.] Were there other lodgers in the house?—There were.

3890. Any of them registered?—No, not for that house.

3891. Chairman.] O'Flanagan appears on the registry, does he not?—He does.

3892. Do you know Jacob Bardin, of Hopkin's-lane?—Yes.

3893. Can you state the nature of his possession or occupation of the house?—Yes. He had but one room, with a small something in the nature of a cupboard off the stairs; he is a painter and glazier, and it is a most wretched room as can be indeed that he had at the time of his registering; and he went forward and he was questioned as to his being a lodger, and he admitted his being a lodger, (I was present at this), and paying 10 d. a week. And he was asked by the presiding barrister, Mr. Guthrie, was it worth 10 l. a year, or was it of the *bona fide* value of 10 l. a year? and he said it was to him worth it, and he was registered.

3894. Who is his landlord?—I think his landlord was a man of the name of King.

3895. Is Bardin upon the registry?—Yes, he is.

3896. Well now, was Mr. King registered; do you know?—King does not reside in the house; it is a house he let out to lodgers; but there is a second person registered for the same house, a man of the name of O'Brien, a victualler, registered out of the very same house.

3897. Mr. Hamilton.] Was he also a lodger?—He was also a lodger. That man himself told me he was only a lodger, and he did go forward and swear it to be worth 10 l.

3898. Chairman.] You cannot state whether these individuals are rated to the watch and light?—They are not.

3899. You are sure of that?—The entire house may be rated; for instance, John O'Flanagan's house is rated at 5 l., the entire house, whereas he himself is only a room-keeper.

3900. Mr. Hamilton.] By a lodger, of course you mean a person who is a mere occasional occupant, having a weekly interest?—Just so.

3901. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you mean weekly lodgers?—Yes, weekly lodgers, paying so much a week.

3902. Do you mean paying their rent weekly?—Yes, paying their rent weekly.

3903. And liable to be turned out?—Liable to be turned out; if they do not pay at the end of the week they may be turned out.

3904. Do you know Thomas Mackie, of White's-lane?—I do.

3905. Is he a lodger?—He is a lodger. I was present at his registry.

3906. Do you know what rent he pays?—He stated his rent to be from 10 d. to 1 s. 2 d. I do not exactly know now the number of pence, but it was such an extraordinary scene almost to see him come forward to register, that it created a sensation in court. He was cross-examined very minutely by Mr. Welch, but it was that it was worth to him 10 l. after his own admission. He stated it was worth to him by rearing pheasants. He did not give an explanation of this, but it was generally well known that this alluded to his keeping a house of ill-fame, and the females he called pheasants, and that by that means it was worth to him 10 l. a year.

3907. Chairman.] Was he a lodger?—He was a lodger.

3908. And is he still lodging there?—I cannot say whether he is lodging there up to the present time.

3909. Mr.

3909. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Is he living in the town at all?—I believe he is.

3910. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Then the Committee are to understand that by rearing pheasants, he did not mean to express that literally?—No, there is no such thing to be seen.

3911. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] I asked you a short time ago with regard to O'Flanagan, as to whether an objection was made at the time of his registering, that he was a lodger; I now ask you the same question as to Bardin, O'Brien, and Mackie?—Yes, I mentioned a few minutes ago that O'Flanagan was admitted at once.

3912. But what I am now asking you is, whether an objection was raised in point of law, to the registering barrister, that he ought not to register these persons because they were lodgers?—The objection was not raised till he made the affidavit. I am now speaking of O'Flanagan's.

3913. O'Flanagan's claim was allowed, and he made the affidavit?—He was cross-examined when he went forward to claim his franchise; he was cross-examined, and he stated the nature of it.

3914. *Chairman*.] Were you present?—I was; and he stated it to be his printing establishment, and that it was worth to him 10 *l.* a year; and he was cross-examined very minutely by Mr. Welch and his son, and he swore it was worth to him 10 *l.* a year, and he was registered.

3915. Now, did Welch object to his being registered?—He asked him, was not he a lodger, paying such a rent.

3916. Did he make an objection to his being a man who ought not to be registered?—In all those cases he did.

3917. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] What was the objection, was it not that the premises were not 10 *l.* a year value?—That he was not a householder, occupying a house value 10 *l.*

3918. I asked you as to Bardin, whether the objection was made that he was only a lodger; whether that was put forward as an objection in point of law to his being registered. I understood you to swear it was not?—In Bardin's case; I do not know whether it was in Bardin's case.

3919. *Chairman*.] Were you present when Bardin's case came on?—I was.

3920. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] I understood you to say, that the objection was not made that he was only a lodger. Was that specific objection ever made to the registry?—It was, that they were not householders.

3921. It was made in the case of O'Flanagan, but not till after the claim was admitted?—It was before the claim was admitted that his objection was made.

3922. Was it made as to O'Brien?—It was.

3923. And as to Mackie?—It was.

3924. Are you quite clear as to that?—I am.

3925. Were you present on all those occasions?—Yes. Indeed I think I was in every one of those cases.

3926. And you can state that the formal objection was put in every one of those cases?—Yes.

3927. Namely, that they were only lodgers, and not householders?—Yes; in this manner it was frequently done: one came up as room-keeper or a lodger; then after his being registered, after the discussion had taken place with respect to him between the presiding barrister and the lawyer employed, a second of the same class came forward, and he made a similar objection to the former one.

3928. So that your evidence is, that in every one of those cases, the objection was taken that the claimants were only lodgers, not householders?—Yes.

3929. Let me ask you, in O'Flanagan's case, whether O'Flanagan, although he occupies only a part of the house, whether he has not an entrance to his part distinct from the entrance of the other lodgers?—He has not.

3930. Has Bardin?—No.

3931. Has O'Brien?—No.

3932. In all those cases there is only one entrance?—Only one entrance.

3933. *Chairman*.] There may be an entrance by the garden?—I mean only one hall-door or street-door.

3934. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Now as to John Meagher, of New-street?—Yes. He is also a room-keeper in the attic story, at 1 *s.* 2 *d.* a week; and he is a man who has created a good deal of noise in our borough from time to time; Meagher, the bootmaker.

Mr. *William Smith*
14 April 1837.

3935. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] He is a conservative, is not he?—The last time he was.
3936. What is his trade?—A boot and shoemaker.
3937. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Was he a lodger at the time of the registration?—He was.
3938. Did he admit it to the barrister?—He did to myself and every one. Every one knew it; it was quite notorious. He admitted it, but he swore it to be worth 10 *l*.
3939. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Then he turned conservative after all?—He did.
3940. Is he still a conservative?—I do not know what he is.
3941. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Are you acquainted with Michael Lacy, of New-street?—Yes, he is another boot and shoemaker.
3942. Is he also a lodger?—Yes.
3943. What rent does he pay?—I think 1 *s*. a week.
3944. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Among those you enumerated, O'Flanagan, Bardin, O'Brien, Mackie and Lacy, have you any political friends with the exception of Meagher?—I do not know that I have.
3945. Did any of them vote for Mr. Bagwell at the last election?—Not one of them voted for Mr. Bagwell. They all voted for Mr. Ronayne.
3946. I am speaking of the last contested election?—They all voted for Mr. Ronayne.
3947. I am speaking of the last contested election?—They all voted for Mr. Ronayne, except Meagher.
3948. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Joseph Burke, of Bagwell-street?—He was a lodger; but decidedly his lodgings were well worth 10 *l*. a year. There were three persons registered out of the same house; the landlord, his lodger "Burke," and the tenant he had in his cellar: the three voted out of the one house.
3949. What is the tenant's name?—Owen Sullivan.
3950. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] There was no objection to his vote?—No; the premises are worth altogether 40 *l*. a year.
3951. The cellar has a distinct entrance?—It has.
3952. And who is the landlord?—John Prendergast.
3953. For whom did he vote?—The three voted for Mr. Ronayne.
3954. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Is Owen Sullivan a lodger or a tenant?—A tenant, occupying the cellar.
3955. Not a weekly tenant?—No.
3956. *Chairman*.] With regard to Prendergast and Burke, had they separate premises, or the same?—Of weekdays Prendergast went through his shop-door, but then he had of course a right to enter through the hall-door as well as Burke.
3957. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] The owner of the house on weekdays was not in the habit of using the hall-door, he went through the shop?—Of course; the shop was the most convenient way for him; but I could not say he did not use the hall-door on weekdays as well.
3958. What part did he occupy besides the shop? the landlord?—He occupied the parlour and shop, and of course bed-rooms.
3959. Above?—Yes.
3960. And Burke occupied three rooms?—Yes, three, as well as I recollect. I have been in the rooms frequently with him; but decidedly the value of the premises was 40 *l*. a year.
3961. *Chairman*.] Was he a weekly tenant or a yearly tenant?—I think a monthly tenant; perhaps a yearly tenant; I am not satisfied as to that.
3962. But he had no entrance that was peculiar to himself?—No; the hall-door was in common to the entire house.
3963. Mr. *Hogg*.] If the shop-door were shut, how would the landlord get in?—Through the hall-door.
3964. The shop-door is sometimes shut by day and night?—Yes; and on Sundays.
3965. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Are you aware who keeps the key?—No.
3966. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] What trade is Prendergast?—He kept a grocery and whiskey shop.
3967. *Chairman*.] Had he a right to go through the hall-door?—Decidedly he had. What were his family to do? I might say the hall-door and shop-door were open to both, at all times.

3968. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Can you state the circumstance of Dennis Slattery, of Johnston-street?—Yes. He was a lodger in a house belonging to a Mrs. Comerford; and he was asked with respect to the rent, and he stated he paid no rent; and he was asked, did he give any other compensation, and he would not tell. He said there was something incontinent, but he meant something inconsistent, and I will not tell you.
3969. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] What is Dennis Slattery by trade?—I do not know what he is by trade.
3970. What is Joseph Burke by trade?—He was a clerk to the forage contractor for the county.
3971. Does he still live in Clonmel?—No, he does not; he is gone.
3972. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Did Dennis Slattery, on his examination, swear his interest to be worth 10 *l.* a year?—He did.
3973. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] What was the objection to his vote?—That he was a lodger, not a householder. He took a room; the room was furnished for him; but there was something between the woman and him, and he would give no sort of evidence about it.
3974. Mr. *Hamilton*.] He admitted he paid no rent?—Yes.
3975. And he occupied only one room?—Occupied a room.
3976. He was admitted notwithstanding?—He was.
3977. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] I believe there is no other person registered in right of that?—No.
3978. What is the house worth?—The house would be a pretty fair value; but he occupied but a room of it.
3979. Mr. *Hamilton*.] I believe the elections at Clonmel give rise to a good deal of excitation?—Indeed they have, from time to time.
3980. Was there any rioting at the election between Bagwell and Rossyne?—There were; the military were obliged to be out frequently through the street, in fact, to protect Mr. Bagwell's voters going up.
3981. Mr. *Morgan John O'Connell*.] Have you ever known elections in Ireland in which the military have not been either parading the street or near at hand?—No, I think not. There are a number of other cases, so far as joint-tenancy is concerned, but those I consider of the full value, perhaps some of them worth 60 *l.* a year.
3982. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Is there any circumstance connected with that election, in reference to yourself, that you wish to explain?—Yes. It having been stated that I had fired on the people, I wish to explain to the Committee how it occurred. After I had been in bed for about an hour and a half, my mistress told me that there was a cry of "Fire," and I awoke, and I did hear the cry of fire. I opened my front-room window, and there were some persons passing by, and I asked where the fire was. They gave me no answer. In a few minutes I recognised one of Mr. Bagwell's agents, and I asked him where was the fire, or what was the matter. He called out to me, and asked me, had I any pistols. I told him that I had. He requested me to hurry down, as the Rev. Mr. Langer Carey would be murdered, for that the mob had attacked them both on their coming home. I went down stairs stripped, and I got my pistols to hand them to this gentleman; he had gone; and there was a crowd of about a dozen, within perhaps 10 yards of my house; I and thought it was the other Mr. Carey. The Rev. Mr. Carey had been beaten, and I went over to his assistance, still stripped, with nothing on but a loose coat, with the pistols in my hand; when I got to where the crowd was, I found that they had all stones in their hands, and I called out, where was Mr. Carey; and they immediately got into an attitude of throwing the stones at me; and I told them I was armed, and if they did do so, I would fire. I then went a little further on. They dispersed immediately then; but I saw another crowd, about eight yards further on, and I thought it was there Mr. Carey might have been hurt or knocked down, and I went on to his assistance, but I did not find him; I found he had got into his house. I was returning instantly into my own place, and I was pelted by, I suppose, about 60 persons; pelted with stones. They were aided by one of our watchmen, who led them on. I came to my hall-door; and when I saw the watchman, I told him that if he entered my door I certainly would shoot him. While telling him so, there was a stone came directly over my head, and hit the jamb of the door. I then shut the door; and knowing the disposition of them at the moment, I went up stairs to my window, which I had opened previously, knowing they would attack my house. I then put out my head

Mr. William Smith.

14 April 1837.

and told them to go about their business, when the stones came in, never broke the glass, but came in through the lower frame and broke the panels of the shutters inside. I then fired a shot, but decidedly not to hit one of them; to endeavour to terrify them and keep them away, and they immediately dispersed.

3983. Mr. Hamilton.] There was no one hurt by the shot?—No.

3984. It was not aimed at any one?—No; not aimed for the purpose of hitting any person.

3985. Mr. Morgan John O'Connell.] Do you live in a wide street or a narrow street?—In a wide street.

3986. Did you fire over to the opposite side?—No; my house is an end house, and there is a field at the other side of the street.

3987. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] I think you said you had served your apprenticeship in Clonmel?—Yes.

3988. To what trade?—To the tobacco and snuff, and soap and candle manufacture.

3989. Is that all one trade?—In Ireland it principally is, at least in country towns.

3990. Are you still in that trade?—No, I am not.

3991. What trade are you in now?—The corn trade.

3992. Are you in the corn and general provision trade?—No, nothing but corn.

Lancæ, 17^o die Aprilis, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Lord Granville Somerset.
Sir Robert Ferguson.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Serjeant Ball.
Mr. French.

Mr. O'Connell.
Mr. Morgan J. O'Connell.
Mr. E. Tenant.
Mr. Lefroy.
Mr. Hogg.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Richard Legge, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Richard Legge.

17 April 1837.

3993. Chairman.] WHERE do you reside?—At Clonmel.

3994. What are you?—I am vestry clerk; that is one of the situations I hold.

3995. How long have you been vestry clerk?—I have been acting as vestry clerk for 20 years or more.

3996. Are you now acting as vestry clerk, or only as deputy?—I am acting as principal.

3997. How long have you been in possession of the office?—About 13 years.

3998. And before that you were seven years acting for the former vestry clerk, were you?—For my father, who was appointed to the duties of the office.

3999. Mr. Hamilton.] It has been your duty as vestry clerk to attend the applotments for the county rates and the parish cess?—It has.

4000. The applotments are made by persons appointed by the ratepayers?—Yes, by the ratepayers at vestry.

4001. In the course of the applotments, I presume discussions arise with regard to the value of the premises?—Of course, so as to apportion the rates on the different ratepayers.

4002-3. Have you a personal knowledge yourself with respect to the premises generally in Clonmel, from the length of time which you have resided there?—Yes; I have resided there ever since I was born; I have not been a month altogether at any time out of the town since.

4004. You also hold the situation of clerk to the commissioners under the 9th Geo. 4?—No; I did hold it.

4005. How long have you ceased to hold it?—Since 1831.

4006. You held it in the year 1828?—Yes, I was appointed by the first commissioners; I was the first clerk under the Act.

4007. Were you present when the valuation under the 9th Geo. 4 was made by the valuers appointed under that Act?—When it was made by them.

4008. Did you attend the meeting of valuers when they were settling the valuation?—I met them several times, but I could not say it was a meeting for valuing; when the valuation was made it was handed to me, when it was attested.

4009. You laid it before the commissioners?—I did.

4010. Were

4010. Were there any appeals against that valuation?—There were.
4011. Were you present when those appeals were discussed or decided?—I was.
4012. Were they appeals for the most part on account of excess of value, or on account of inadequate value?—There were no appeals for inadequate value; they were all for over value.
4013. Do you know how many cases of appeals there were?—I think, as well as I can remember, between 30 and 40 appeals, but those appeals some of them included several houses; an appeal by one person against the value set on several houses.
4014. *Chairman.*] How many houses or premises were altogether valued at that period out of which 30 or 40 appeals were lodged?—I should suppose about 1,000.
4015. Then out of about 1,000 valuations there were from 30 to 40 appeals brought?—From 30 to 40 appeals, I should say, including perhaps from 50 to 60 houses.
4016. Those appeals were universally on account of the valuation being too high?—Yes.
4017. Then out of those appeals how many were allowed?—How many were altered by the judgment of the commissioners? I cannot say the exact number; I suppose the alterations did not amount to more than from 15 to 20; I would rather say under, if anything.
4018. Now, were those alterations invariably reducing the valuation?—Reducing.
4019. Now under your Act, supposing it had appeared on examination that the valuation had been too inconsiderable instead of too great, had the commissioners power of raising the valuation?—They had not the power of raising.
4020. Are you quite convinced of that?—There were two cases of appeal allowed by the Act; one was against the valuation for excess of value simply, and another with regard to relative value.
4021. Now with regard to relative value, that was, that the parties complained that their houses were rated too high in comparison with other houses?—Exactly.
4022. How many cases of that description were there?—I can remember but two.
4023. How did it turn out with regard to those two?—As well as I can remember, the valuation was allowed to stand.
4024. Now from the investigation which took place with regard to that class of appeals, did it appear that the whole of the town was valued upon a fair valuation?—That is with regard to the relative value; do you mean that?
4025. I mean with regard to the positive value?—It was considered that it was too high.
4026. That taking it throughout, the houses in the town were valued too highly?—Too highly.
4027. That was the feeling of the commissioners?—The feeling of the commissioners was, a good number of them, to alter the entire valuation by reducing it by so much per cent.; that is, the thing was discussed; but on reading over the Act they found they had not that power, or at least they thought so.
4028. But upon the whole they conceived that the houses in the town were generally put too high?—Too high.
4029. By too high, do you mean above their real value?—Above the value that was required by the Act of Parliament; the full and improved yearly value.
4030. Above that?—Above that.
4031. Does that observation of yours apply to any one particular class of valuation, or to all the classes?—To the valuation as a whole.
4032. Then it applied as much to the 10 *l.* class as it did to that of the higher?—As it did to the higher.
4033. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Who were the commissioners at that time?—They were the principal gentlemen; merchants in the town.
4034. I presume gentlemen of all parties?—Gentlemen of all parties, both as to creed and politics.
4035. Under the Act they are elected, I believe, by the occupiers of houses above the value of 5 *l.*?—Not the first election; it was all persons who were rated (as well as I can remember) by the Act either for parish cess or county cess; it was to all persons paying rates previously.
4036. They are elected by those who occupy houses?—All subsequent elections to the first are to be made by persons rated in the books at 5 *l.* At the first election,

Mr. Richard Legg.

17 April 1837.

tion, of course, there was no valuation of the kind, and then there was a different constituency.

4037. What I meant to ask you was, whether or not the commissioners were not elected by the great body of the inhabitants of the town who occupy houses that are above the value of 5 *l.*?—I was not present at the meeting.

4038. *Chairman.*] As vestry clerk were you in the habit of rating the inhabitants?—I have not of myself rated them.

4039. No, not of your own power; but as the organ of the vestry, were you not in the habit of inspecting the rates, at all events?—Yes; in the first instance I made out a list of the persons who ought to pay, and I attended a meeting of the applotters when they came to do the business, and took down their decisions.

4040. That was before the 9th Geo. 4?—That was before.

4041. Then the inhabitants of the town of Clonmel were rated, at all events?—Yes.

4042. All the houses were rated, and all the premises were rated?—All rated.

4043. But under the Act of Parliament, the 9th Geo. 4, which says, "that all inhabitants that shall have been rated by the parish vestry, and whose houses were of the computed value of 5 *l.*, that such persons shall have votes"; would not that include the great body of the inhabitants of Clonmel?—It would.

4044. Have you any doubt that the election of the commissioners in the year 1828 was conducted upon the principle of the Act of Parliament, and in conformity with the Act of Parliament?—It was; every meeting was advertised according to the Act.

4045. And the election made under the provisions of that Act, and according to the terms of that Act?—Yes.

4046. And according to the principles of that Act?—Yes.

4047. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] I believe the vestry has nothing at all to do with the rate; you were vestry clerk?—Yes.

4048. What had you to do with the making of the rate; as vestry clerk had you anything on earth to do with it?—Which rate?

4049. The rate upon the houses?—I attended the meeting of the applotters.

4050. But it was the applotments the vestry had to do with?—Yes.

4051. But you had nothing to do with the valuation of the premises?—Nothing to do with the valuation.

4052. Nor had the vestry?—Nor had the vestry.

4053. *Chairman.*] But you were cognizant of what was done by the vestry?—I was.

4054-5. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] And what was done by the vestry was merely applotting, not rating or valuing?—It was done according to the value that the applotters set on the premises.

4056. I am speaking of the valuation made of the premises under the 9th Geo. 4, the vestry had nothing to do with that?—No.

4057. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Were you present during any portion of the registration in 1832?—I was.

4058. Did you attend there with the books of valuation with a view of giving evidence?—No.

4059. Had you been summoned there?—I had.

4060. Were you examined as a witness?—I was.

4061. In what cases?—In the case of Michael Connors.

4062. Will you state what took place in reference to the case of Michael Connors?—I was called on by the counsel who was opposing Connors' registration, and I was asked if I knew the house; I said I did not know the individual house in which Connors lived, but that I was well acquainted with all the houses in the court, and that no house in the court was of the value of 10 *l.* except one.

4063. Did you specify that one?—*Mr. Romayne* asked me was that the house Connors lived in, and I said no. That was a house occupied by a man of the name of Mara.

4064. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Do I understand you right that you answered you did not know the individual house that Connors lived in, but you knew all the houses in the court?—What I mean by that is, I could not identify one single house out of the number as the one Connors lived in.

4065. Had you been inside all the houses?—Indeed most of them.

4066. Could you state that you had ever been in Connors' house?—No, I could not, because I did not know which of the houses was Connors'.

4067. Then,

4067. Then, of course you cannot state to this day that you have been in Connors' house?—Yes, I can.
4068. Since that?—Yes.
4069. But not before?—Not before.
4070. Not before you were called upon to give evidence as to the value of Connors' house?—No, not before.
4071. Mr. O'Connell.] Were you before Mr. Guthrie?—Yes.
4072. Were you examined in any other case but that one?—No.
4073. The corporation had counsel?—Mr. Welch was counsel.
4074. Who was he counsel for?—I could not say that; I do not know who employed him; I heard he was employed by Mr. Bagwell's agent; that was the impression on my mind.
4075. Have you attended any registry before Mr. Hobson?—I believe I have; I cannot well recollect.
4076. He gave satisfaction in his registries?—He did, as far as I have heard.
4077. You remember Mr. Howley?—Yes.
4078. He has given satisfaction?—He has, in the general way, given satisfaction.
4079. So that the only registry you complain of is that before Mr. Guthrie?—That is the only registry I complain of; some persons have been registered since that I do not consider of sufficient value; but, as to the general way, harristers ever since have given satisfaction to all parties.
4080. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And I believe you are pretty quick-sighted on the other side of politics, are you not; you are a conservative?—I am a conservative in politics.
4081. A pretty strong one?—I am not an obstinate man.
4082. But you are open to conviction?—I am open to conviction.
4083. Mr. O'Connell.] I believe you were not a conservative till within the last four or five years?—No.
4084. What were you called before you were called a conservative?—Indeed I cannot well say; politics were not so much talked of.
4085. In Ireland they are a good deal talked of; what party were you used to belong to?—I believe the tory party was what they were termed.
4086. Something a little stronger than that; was it not Orangemen?—I believe all Protestants are called Orangemen in Ireland; nearly all.
4087. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Will you enumerate the offices you now hold; mention as many as you can recollect; you told us you were parish clerk?—No, vestry clerk; but I tell you now I am parish clerk.
4088. Schoolmaster, I believe?—No.
4089. You have been?—I have been.
4090. You are clerk to the gaol committee?—I am.
4091. Assisting clerk to the savings bank?—I am.
4092. My catalogue ends there; perhaps now you will pursue the thing, and tell me what other offices you hold?—I am clerk to the turnpike board, and assisting secretary to the Protestant Orphan Society for the county Tipperary.
4093. Anything else?—I believe I have enumerated them all.
4094. But you are quite sure you are a strong conservative?—I am.
4095. Mr. O'Connell.] Besides the nickname of Orangeman, were you really an Orangeman?—I was.
4096. Belonging to a lodge?—Yes.
4097. What lodge did you belong to?—I could not tell you the number of it.
4098. Why not?—I was not long enough on, for I suppose I was not more than two months belonging to the society.
4099. Did you hold any office in it?—No.
4100. Who was the master of your lodge?—I think Mr. Audley; he was clerk.
- 4101-2. Clerk to whom?—At that time he was clerk to Mr. Graham.
4103. What is Mr. Graham; what business is he?—He is an ironmonger.
4104. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Is that Mr. George Graham?—It is.
4105. The gentleman who is in attendance as a witness?—Yes, who is in attendance to-day.
4106. Mr. O'Connell.] Was Mr. Smith a member of your lodge?—I believe not.
4107. Was he an Orangeman?—I believe not.
4108. When did you become an Orangeman?—I believe it was some time last December twelvemonth.
4109. Mr. French.] You said it was two months before they were done away?—Yes, I think so; about that time; I could not well say.

- Mr. Richard Legge. 4110. Mr. Hamilton.] Were you present when Michael Connors himself was examined before the barrister?—I was.
4111. What was the nature of his evidence?—I think he stated his rent was 6*l.* a year.
4112. Did he swear that the house was of 10*l.* value?—He said it was worth 10*l.* to him.
4113. Mr. O'Connell.] Did he swear it?—He swore it; I am saying what he said on his oath.
4114. Mr. Hamilton.] He was cross-examined, I presume, by Mr. Welch?—He was.
4115. Was there any admission with regard to the intrinsic value of the house on his cross-examination?—Except as stating the rent he paid for it.
4116. Mr. O'Connell.] Was he asked how he made it out to be worth 10*l.* a-year?—I think he was.
4117. And he accounted for it as well as he could?—As far as I remember he did; his answer does not bear such an impression on my mind as that I would now say positively.
4118. But your impression is, he was examined to that point?—It is.
4119. Before the barrister decided in his favour?—Yes.
4120. Was there any other witness examined against him but you?—No.
4121. At that time you had never been in his house; you did not know which house it was?—I did not know which house was his.
4122. Now do you estimate the value of the houses at the rent they produce; is that your estimate?—I estimate the value at the rent a house would produce if unlet at the day.
4123. You do not take into calculation how much the tenant might make of it by letting lodgings?—No, I do not; I stated that to the barrister, that I was certain, from my knowledge of the houses, there was not one, if untenanted, would let for 7*l.* a year.
4124. But you did not say more might not be made of it by letting it in nightly or weekly lodgings?—No.
4125. You did not at all take into calculation how much might be made of it by lodgings?—No.
4126. Nor how much might be made by any given trade; the man might be a tailor, cooper, or a nail-maker?—He is a hrazier, and I believe carries on the business of a master sweep.
4127. He carried on his hrazing business in that house probably?—He did.
4128. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Is he now on the registry?—No; he has left that house.
4129. Then he is not now a voter?—He is not now a voter.
4130. Chairman.] In point of fact, for the purpose of local taxation, such considerations were not brought into account, were they, as what trade the man carried on?—No.
4131. For local taxation the value of the house in the market was what was taken as the criterion of value for the taxation?—Yes.
4132. Mr. O'Connell.] The rent value?—The rent may not be the value.
4133. But you consider the highest rent that can be got for a house is the criterion?—I do.
4134. And that is the estimate you formed?—It is; what the landlord and tenant agree between themselves.
4135. Chairman.] And it is on that estimate that the taxation is paid?—That I consider to have been the basis of the valuation under the 9th Geo. 4.
4136. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] However that is your conjecture; you did not make the valuation?—No, I did not; but I was very well acquainted with the valuation.
- 4137.] Were you present when it was made?—I had the valuation at the Court-house for the inspection of the public.
4138. That was after it was made?—Yes.
4139. But you had nothing to do with making the valuation itself?—Nothing whatever.
4140. Now did you not tell us just now about 1,000 premises were valued?—I should think so.
4141. Could you form a guess at the number of houses that were not valued?—I could not.

4142. Have you any idea what number of houses there is in Clonmel altogether?—No, I have not.

4143. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you think any man will pay a rent for a house without having some value for his money, over and above his rent; some benefit?—I do not know; I should think a man would not give a landlord more for a house than he could get it for from another.

4144. My question is, whether any man would pay 10*l.* a year for a house, if he found he could not get some value, some benefit for his money, over and above 10*l.*?—I cannot understand that.

4145. Are you a farmer at all; have you any land?—No.

4146. You know Clonmel, and every man in Clonmel must understand something more or less of farming; have you any notion of farming at all?—I do not understand farming; I have never been engaged in any business of the kind.

4147. Do you think any man would give 10*l.* for a farm that he did not get some profit from, over and above the 10*l.* a year?—I should consider that his own labour on it would produce the profit.

4148. No matter how the profit was produced; would any man give 10*l.* a year for a farm that did not think he would make something beyond it?—I do not think any man would give so much for a farm as that it would swallow up all he could produce from it.

4149. Do you think any man would give 10*l.* a year for a house if he had not some benefit from it over and above the 10*l.*?—I really cannot see what likeness there is between the two things, a man taking a house as a residence for himself to live in, and a man taking a farm to make a livelihood by.

4150. Now, whether as a residence or as a livelihood, in your mind, I shall not inquire; but I ask you this question, would any man give 10*l.* a year for a house unless he thought he would have some benefit over and above 10*l.* worth for himself?—I would certainly take a house if I were to occupy it myself, and give 10*l.* for it, and it was worth no more; but if I wanted to make a livelihood by taking a house and letting it in subdivisions, either altogether or living in a part of it myself, then I would not pay the rent for a house unless it was some advantage in that way.

4151. Do not you perceive that when you reside in it you calculate on a small benefit more than the 10*l.* arising to you by reason of its being your residence; do not you perceive that?—I do perceive the distinction you want to come at.

4152. If you would not give the 10*l.* to get back only 10*l.* if you did not reside in the house, you would not give the 10*l.* unless you had a beneficial occupation of something of more value than the 10*l.* you gave for the house in which you resided?—I do not comprehend it.

4153. Have you not said that you would not give 10*l.* rent for a house in which you did not reside unless you got more rent for it than 10*l.*?—I did, if I were to let it again.

4154. That is, you would not in that case give 10*l.* without having some value for your money more than the actual return of the money itself?—No, I would not.

4155. Now would you give 10*l.* for a house for your residence unless you got by your occupation some benefit that was at least equal to the 10*l.*?—I would give 10*l.* for a house for my own occupation without letting any part of it, if I wanted the house.

4156. Would not you expect that the benefit to yourself from a house for which you gave 10*l.* would be more to you than keeping the 10*l.* in your pocket?—If I take a house at 10*l.* for my own advantage, for merely my own living in, and another man takes a house of a similar kind for 10*l.*, he may make more of it if he lets part of it and only retains part of it for his own use.

4157. I come to yourself, I am not asking you about anybody else; but as I have the honour of seeing a gentleman who fills so many capacities, and I dare say fills them well, I wish to know from him whether he would pay 10*l.* a year for the occupation of a house or anything else unless he did conceive that he would have more benefit by the 10*l.* laid out in that manner than he would have if he had kept it in his pocket?—I cannot conceive that. If I wanted a house to live in—do you speak of keeping 10*l.* in my pocket and wanting a residence?

4158. I should suppose you would reside somewhere; I exclude that; but do you mean to say that a man pays for a house all that it is worth to him, so that

Mr. Richard Legger.

17 April 1837.

he has no benefit by his 10*l.*—I do conceive that he does, if he can get another house in the town of equal accommodation for the same money.

4159. Precisely; but in either case he derives benefit from his 10*l.*?—He does, he gets the occupation of the house.

4160. And a benefit beyond the mere 10*l.*, otherwise he would not give the 10*l.*; is not that plain?—I think if he gets value for his 10*l.* it is all he must require, unless he pays a fine; if he gets a 10*l.* house for 10*l.* that is all he must require.

4161. If a man gives away 10*l.*, and gets only a 10*l.* house, and no more, he gets value for his 10*l.*; is that your idea?—Yes.

4162. Do not you know he is at a loss in that case?—I do not think he is at a loss.

4163. Is he not at the loss of the interest of the 10*l.*?—I do not conceive that he is, unless it was a merchantable commodity.

4164. Could he not put the 10*l.* into the savings bank?—He could, but then he could not live in the savings bank; he must have some place to reside in; he must have clothes to wear; and I do not see that a man, when he pays so much for clothes, or any other thing that is a necessary of life, that he makes anything by it if he pays a marketable value for it.

4165. That is what I want to raise your mind to, or to show you have not such an ingredient in your mind; now recollect, you have admitted that if he paid the 10*l.* into the savings bank he would get interest for it?—He would.

4166. And his 10*l.* would be somewhere about ten guineas at the end of the year, would it not?—Yes.

4167. If he pays that 10*l.* for a house, will he not be at a loss of the 10*l.*, unless he gets some benefit to himself more than the 10*l.* would be?—No, I cannot conceive that he is at a loss.

4168. *Chairman.*] Is it the habit in Ireland of tenants to pay their rents beforehand?—In some cases.

4169. Is it the habit in Clonmel universally for a man to pay 10*l.* for a house before he occupies the house?—No, not usually.

4870. And therefore he cannot lose the interest of the money until he has paid it?—No.

4171. And does not he pay the 10*l.*, supposing he rents a 10*l.* house, for the advantage of residing in it and his family?—Yes, that is what I conceive.

4172. Then, supposing his family to be very large, of course he requires more accommodation, does he not?—He does.

4173. And requiring more accommodation, if he wished to let his lodgings, he could not let so much of his house as if he had a small family in the same house?—No.

4174. Then does he not derive a positive advantage from lodging a large family in that house?—I think so; he requires more.

4175. And is not that the advantage he derives from paying this 10*l.* a year?—I think so.

4176. Is not that what he looks to when he hires the house, the accommodation of his family?—I think so.

4177. That is the first consideration?—Yes; and the next is, if he can have any of it to spare, he lightens his rent by letting lodgings.

4178. Then though a lodging-house must be more valuable to him, as far as the receipt of money goes, is it not the same thing to him as far as the real value goes?—I think so.

4179. *Mr. O'Connell.*] The accommodation is the value he gets?—That is the value he gets.

4180. That is the benefit he gets by it?—That is what he gets for his money.

4181. Now, though he pays the first year's rent at the end of the year, the time of lodging the 10*l.* must be at the end of the year; do not you comprehend that if he had not that 10*l.* to pay he would have it to lodge?—He would.

4182. And then the question of profit by interest would arise precisely at the end of the second year, would it not?—It would; that is, provided he could live without a house, but he would have to pay rent in the same manner for lodgings and lose the interest he would get for the year.

4183. *Chairman.*] Whenever he pays for his bread he loses the interest of that money, does he not?—He does; or when he buys clothes he loses interest.

4184. Mr. O'Connell.] But then he gets other value than interest?—He gets value in food and the necessaries of life; if he could live without food or raiment he could lodge all his money in the savings bank.

4185. *Chairman.*] Does he get any value for the food for which he pays money beyond the food itself?—He gets it at the market price; he goes wherever the largest loaf is to be given.

4186. I presume he is obliged to buy food?—He is; he might lose the interest of money if he did not buy bread.

4187. Mr. O'Connell.] That is precisely the point; what the man gets must be more valuable to him than the money he parts with; is not bread more valuable to him than the money he parts with?—Certainly.

4188. Are not lodgings more valuable to him than the money he parts with?—Certainly.

4189. The house must be more valuable to him than the money he parts with, or he would not hire the house?—No.

4190. *Chairman.*] The object of money, generally speaking, is to obtain accommodation one way or the other, is it not?—Yes.

4191. Mr. O'Connell.] Then you cannot tell the Committee how many persons that brazier might accommodate as lodgers in his house?—I can describe the house, for I have been in it; that would be according to the description of lodgers he had, or that he would be able to obtain.

4192. But poor lodgers, who paid him a shilling a week?—By keeping one room for himself, he might accommodate another family up stairs.

4193. By another family, do you mean four or five persons?—Yes, four or five persons, such as would live in such a house as that.

4194. They would pay a shilling a week for it?—They might pay a shilling a week for it.

4195. That shilling a week would be from the four or five persons who lodged in the one room, while he and his family lodged in another?—Yes; I do not say a shilling a week from each lodger.

4196. Are you aware it has been proved that the poor lodgers in Clonmel pay from 1s. to 1s. 6d. a week for the use of a room; for a corner for a bed?—I do not know that.

4197. Do you know whether they do or not?—I do not believe they pay so much when they sublet a room.

4198. Do you know of your own knowledge whether it be so?—I should say not, from what is paid for some of those rooms; that they would not get so much for a single lodging.

4199. Do you know any case of such lodging of your own knowledge, and mention the house if you do?—Of persons lodging in another lodger's room?

4200. Of four persons lodging in a room?—No, I am not acquainted with lodgings of that kind.

4201. Three?—I am not acquainted with lodgings of that kind; I have heard there are such lodgings.

4202. Mr. Hamilton.] Describe the house of Andrew Armstrong, of Irishtown?—It is a house with one room below stairs, and a corresponding apartment or apartments above; I have not been up stairs in it; with a small yard and a small garden in the rear.

4203. Do you know the rent which Andrew Armstrong pays for it?—I believe the rent is 6l. a year.

4204. *Chairman.*] How do you know that?—From Mr. Bagwell's agent.

4205. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Who is he?—Mr. Douglas.

4206. Is he a witness here?—Not that I know of.

4207. You heard it from him?—Yes.

4208. Mr. Hamilton.] What value do you set on that house?—I consider that is the full value of it.

4209. *Chairman.*] Does Mr. Douglas receive the rent?—He does.

4210. Mr. Hamilton.] Can you state whether Andrew Armstrong has been registered or not?—He is registered, but he is not now living in the house; he voted at the two elections for Mr. Bagwell.

4211. Mr. O'Connell.] He voted in the conservative interest?—He did.

4212. Both elections?—Both elections.

4213. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Mr. Bagwell's agent told you his rent was only 6l.?

—Yes.

0.39.

Mr. Richard Legger.

4214. Do you consider that the full value?—I do.

17 April 1837.

4215. Do you think Mr. Bagwell's agent considered it the full value?—I think he did, for he told me he would let the whole of the houses in that range for 5 l to a single solvent tenant.

4216. And yet he had no objection to this man voting twice for him at two successive elections?—I suppose not when he was on the register; I suppose he would rather have him vote for him than against him.

4217. Then he was liable to swear he had a 10 l interest in the house?—He must have sworn it, or he would not be registered.

4218. And he was equally liable for swearing at the election, that he had continued to reside, and had the same qualification?—Yes.

4219. That meant the 10 l qualification; the qualification was the 10 l qualification?—Yes, of course he swore to the same thing.

4220. Mr. Bagwell's agent attended the elections?—I believe he did.

4221. You were active for Mr. Bagwell?—I was.

4222. You were one of his agents employed for him?—I was not employed.

4223. You volunteered, did you?—I was a volunteer.

4224. You canvassed these people?—I did not.

4225. What did you do?—What I did principally at the election was revising the lists.

4226. What do you call revising the lists?—Seeing what persons had removed; from my knowledge of the town, I was able to mark them so as to give objections.

4227. Those who had lost the franchise?—Yes, by death or removal.

4228. Did you do nothing else?—No, I do not think I did; that was my principal business.

4229. None of the money went through your hands?—No money whatever, nor would I undertake such an office for any man.

4230. What office would you not undertake?—The office of handing money for a man to sell his franchise.

4231. Mr. Hamilton.] Could you state whether any of those whom you knew to have removed voted at the election?—At the last election there was one case.

4232. Can you mention the name of the voter?—Patrick Quinan.

4233. Mr. O'Connell.] That was exceedingly wrong, was it not?—I thought so.

4234. Of course you could have no doubt of it; surely you could have no doubt that that was a fraud?—Yes; but when you hear the circumstances relative to it—

4235. Who did he vote for?—He voted for Mr. Ronayne.

4236. Do you wish to add any circumstances?—I want to add the circumstances; he is a respectable man, and he may have perhaps mistaken the thing; he was registered out of a house in Richmond-street.

4237. Chairman.] A schoolmaster, was he not?—He was a schoolmaster; he voted at the first election for Mr. Ronayne; he was then living in the house; between that and the next election he left that house and went to reside in another; previous to the second election he removed from that house and took up his residence in the former house for which he had been registered.

4238. He went back?—He went back.

4239. Mr. O'Connell.] The house had continued vacant in his hands?—I believe it was vacant for a long time; I am not certain whether a tenant had come into it in the meantime.

4240. It might have been vacant for what you know; he might have had it laying on his hands?—I do not think he had, for he was a yearly tenant, and would not keep two houses.

4241. He got back into that house?—Yes.

4242. And at the time of the election he was actually living in the house?—He was, but he had registered again for that house in Richmond-street.

4243. He had re-registered?—Yes, after the time elapsed for qualifying him from his second taking of it.

4244. Do you mean that he re-registered out of the same house out of which he voted on both occasions?—Yes.

4245. Mr. French.] And he voted out of the first registry?—Yes, the second was not in time.

4246. Mr. O'Connell.] But you feel this, that if a man left a house altogether, and ceased to reside there totally, somebody else was residing in it; in that case it would be a fraud?—I consider it a fraud.

4247. A very

4247. A very gross fraud?—And perjury if he took the oath.
4248. You know if a freeman registered and went off, and had gone more than seven miles off and voted in that way, he would be guilty of a fraud?—I cannot decide that point.
4249. Why not; a freeman must reside within seven miles?—He must when he registers; but having heard that lawyers differ upon the qualification, I could not decide it.
4250. Are you a freeman?—No.
4251. You are a registered voter; a householder?—A householder.
4252. Of course you always voted for Mr. Bagwell?—On the two occasions upon which he stood for the borough I voted for him.
4253. The only two in which there was a contest?—Yes.
4254. You could not vote for him upon any other?—No.
4255. How long have you been in Clonmel?—Ever since I was born.
4256. Do you remember when the Mountcashel family had the nomination of Clonmel?—No, that is not within my recollection.
4257. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Mr. Quinan was enabled to vote, though his qualification had ceased, from his name remaining on the registry?—Yes, he produced the certificate of the first registry.
4258. *Chairman*.] His re-registry the second time proved he thought the first registry was a bad one?—I considered so.
4259. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Are you acquainted with the house of Patrick Callaghan, Slatery's-lane?—I know the house; I have never been in it.
4260. Are you aware what rent he pays for it?—I am not aware what rent he pays for it; but I am aware of the value of the house from circumstances.
4261. State its value?—It was valued in the commissioners' books in 1828 at 5*l*.
4262. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Have you got those books?—Not in my possession.
4263. Where are they now?—In the possession of my successor.
4264. *Chairman*.] Mr. Kelly is your successor?—Mr. Kelly. At the time of Mr. Bagwell's petition against the return of Mr. Roanoyne I got authority to search the commissioners' books, and I found that this house had been omitted from the rate book.
4265. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Was it appealed from?—I found on searching that it had been appealed from on the second commissioners being elected, on account of being over-valued, and the commissioners had decided that it should be erased from the books as not being of the value of 5*l*.
4266. Did Patrick Callaghan vote at the election?—He did.
4267. Is he still occupying the same house?—I believe he is.
4268. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Who did he vote for?—Mr. Roanoyne.
4269. At both elections?—At both elections.
4270. *Chairman*.] Were you examined before that Committee which sat in 1833; the Parliamentary Committee?—I was.
4271. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Are you acquainted with the house of Edward Mackin of Irishtown?—I am.
4272. Can you state the rent of that house?—It is the same as Andrew Armstrong's; they are both in the same row, the same height, the same extent, the same garden, the same yard.
4273. And you conceive it to be of the same value?—Of the same value.
4274. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Were you ever in that house?—I was in it.
4275. Do you mean before the valuation?—Before the valuation? I cannot say; I might have been in it.
4276. You cannot recollect, then, when you were in it?—I was in it before I came over on Mr. Bagwell's petition; I went to examine it.
4277. That was in 1833?—Yes, in 1833; he is not at present living in it, nor did he vote at the last election; he had removed before the last election.
4278. Are you acquainted with the house of Richard O'Meagher, of Morton-street?—Yes.
4279. Can you state the rent of that house?—Eight pounds is the rent of that house, and I consider it the value, but no more.
4280. *Chairman*.] How do you know it is 8*l*?—I had it from the landlord.
4281. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Who is the landlord?—Morgan Jones.
4282. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Where is he?—He is in Clonmel, I believe.

- Mr. *Richards* Logge. 4283. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] What is he by trade?—He carries on the bakery business.
4284. Who did he vote for at the election?—For Mr. *Bagwell*.
4285. And he told you the rent was 8 *l*.?—Yes.
4286. Now, were you ever in the house?—I was.
4287. When?—I have been frequently in it; I was in it in 1833.
4288. Do you mean to say you were all over it?—I cannot say I was, but I have been in other houses of the same description, five or six.
4289. Were you ever in more than one apartment of that house?—I think it is very likely I was; I have been in most of those houses.
4290. But you cannot say you were?—No, I cannot positively in that house; not up-stairs, but I was up-stairs in the next house, which is the same size.
4291. Then your valuation is, after all, conjecture; you conjecture that the house is of the same description as the other houses you have been in?—I know it is; they are the same height in roof, the same extent in front, the same extent in rear, and have the same yards.
4292. Were you in the yard?—I was in the next yard, from which I could see all the others.
4293. But you were not in this?—I could not actually say I was; I was up-stairs in others, I can say that; I believe I was up-stairs in that, for I have frequently gone into that house.
4294. Your judgment is that it is worth 8 *l*. only?—Yes.
4295. Now let me ask you this: suppose that one or more persons of competent judgment were to value that house at 10 *l*., two or three persons; would you be inclined to distrust your own judgment; persons who know as much about value as you?—No, I would not.
4296. You would still persist?—I would.
4297. You told me just now you are not an obstinate man?—Nor am I; but when I formed an opinion on dry premises I would hold to it; another person may value it upon the same ground as one of the gentlemen of the Committee has been trying to make me; another person may value it for letting lodgings.
4298. I am not speaking of letting lodgings, but I am speaking of what I call the intrinsic value; you say the intrinsic value of this house is only 8 *l*.?—Yes.
4299. I am putting the case, supposing two gentlemen of character and judgment were to value it at 10 *l*., would that incline you at all to distrust your own judgment?—It would not, by no means; I would uphold my own opinion.
4300. Supposing, now, that they valued it at 9 *l*. and you at 8 *l*., would that make you distrust your own judgment?—No; I think there would be very little difference between us.
4301. But would you be inclined to think them right and you wrong, supposing you came as close as that?—No; I think I am sufficiently acquainted with those houses to speak to their value; I call rent and value the same when the premises are let by the year.
4302. But supposing you did not know what the rent was?—Then I might very likely be inclined to form the opinion of two other gentlemen who would say it was worth 9 *l*.; I would in that case; but knowing the yearly rent that those houses have been let at, and with my own opinion, makes me still hold out that I am right in saying so; but if I had not the information as to the rent, I would probably incline to the opinion of two other gentlemen who would say it was worth 9 *l*.
4303. *Chairman*.] I suppose before you differed in opinion with other persons, you would like to know who those other persons were, would you not?—Certainly; and I would like to know on what their opinion was founded before I would surrender my opinion.
4304. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] In fact, you would go very cautiously to work before you surrendered your own opinion?—Yes.
4305. And it must be a very strong case that would induce you to surrender your own opinion?—Yes.
4306. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Had you put any value on the house before you heard what the rent was?—Yes.
4307. How much did you value it at?—The sum of 8 *l*., from knowing the rent at which houses of a similar description are set generally through the town.
4308. Then it was with reference to the rent that you put the value upon it?—Yes.

—Yes, what it would let for if unoccupied; a fair tenant and the rent asked and agreed upon.

4309. When no fine is paid, rent and value in your opinion are synonymous?—
Yes, I think so; I consider that to be the value decided upon by the two best judges of the house, that is, the man who owns it and the man who takes it from him.

4310. *Chairman.*] Is Morgan Jones, the baker, a rich man?—He is.

4311. Is he apt to give away his houses for less than he thinks them worth?—
I think not, for he made his own money, and he knows how to make use of his property to the best advantage for himself.

4312. *Mr. O'Connell.*] There has been no speaking of a commission of larceny against him?—Not the least: to show you that he knows how to make use of his own money, he has ceased to let those houses to single tenants, and he now lets them by single rooms, so that he makes the profits that would arise to a man taking a whole house and letting part of it.

4313. He makes more then by letting them in single rooms?—Yes.

4314. How much additional profit is made by letting them in that way?—
I cannot say; he considers that by retailing them he can get more than by wholesale.

4315. Then the money which a tenant would make by letting the rooms, he now makes and gets for himself?—Yes, he gets the retail profit instead of the wholesale.

4316. *Chairman.*] Taking the greater risk?—Yes, taking the greater trouble; he has more to collect from than setting them entirely.

4317. And also a less certainty of all the apartments being let all the year?—
Yes, he has.

4318. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Is he a calculating man?—I think he is.

4319. And if he had not the prospect of making more, he would of course prefer having a single tenant?—If he could get tenants to take the whole, that he was sure would pay him, I believe he would not be troubled by letting them in lodgings.

4320. Do you mean the whole court?—I mean each house.

4321. *Chairman.*] Then I suppose his trouble and increased risk must be deducted from the increased rent which he obtains, must it not?—Yes; and also the expense of keeping those premises in repair for each tenant.

4322. Now is one man occupying a whole house and not subletting it likely to cause as much wear and tear of the house as when it is let out in that sort of way?—No; I think not.

4323. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] You spoke of the valuation of 1828, and I think you stated that the commissioners or some of them considered it too high?—Yes, I said so; and the people generally.

4324. Now did it ever occur to you, or did you ever hear that in point of fact several of the houses were valued considerably too low?—That may have been the case. I can speak to my own house; the house I now live in is valued in the commissioners' books at 5 *l.* more than I pay for it.

4325. I am asking you if you know an instance where the house was valued too low?—Yes.

4326. Can you name an instance?—Yes.

4327. Several?—Several.

4328. Have you known instances of houses valued on that occasion at not half their actual value?—No; not to my knowledge.

4329. Do you know the house of Joshua Moore, in Johnson-street?—Yes, I know the house; that is, I cannot say I was in it and through it, but I know Joshua Moore is a householder, and lives in a certain street.

4330. Do you happen to know the valuation of that house; what sum that was valued at?—No; I could not tell without reference to the book.

4331. What do you take to be the value of that house at present?—Indeed, I should think any house in that line of street could not be worth more than 10 *l.*

4332. Would you be surprised to hear he actually pays 15 *l.* a year rent?—
I would not.

4333. And that being the case, would you be surprised to hear that the valuation of that house is only 6 *l.*?—Yes, that would surprise me; it is a thing I would not be prepared to expect.

4334. *Mr. French.*] Why do you say it would not surprise you to hear the
rent

Mr. Richard Logge.
17 April 1837.

rent was 15 *l.*, and it would surprise you to hear the valuation was but 6 *l.*?—I think I said I would not be surprised if I heard it was 15 *l.* rent, but I would be surprised if I heard the valuation was 6 *l.*

4335. Will you explain why you would not be surprised in one instance, and you would be surprised in the other?—Because that street I consider a street of business; there are some small houses in it, but from the position of the house in the street, I would not be surprised at hearing the rent was 15 *l.*

4336. But you say your valuation of the house has been 10 *l.*, and you admit the rent to be the best criterion of value you know?—Yes.

4337. Do you state you are not astonished at the rent being 5 *l.* above your valuation?—I did not value it.

4338. You said you considered it worth 10 *l.*?—I said that no house in that street would be worth 10 *l.*; I said I was not in the house, I only knew that house, and that a certain man lives in it.

4339. Do you say the house may be worth 15 *l.*?—It may; I would not be surprised if I heard so.

4340. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] I was going to ask about the house of Thomas Everard, of Johnson-street; what would you say would be the value of that house at present?—From my knowledge of it, (I have not been through it,) but from its position in the street, and the street that it is in, I should say that that would be worth 10 *l.*, if not more.

4341. Then you would not be surprised to hear it paid 11 *l.* 15 *s.* 10 *d.* rent?—I would not; I would not doubt it.

4342. Then you would be surprised to hear that that was valued at only 6 *l.* in this valuation of 1828?—No, this valuation was made in 1828, and there may be alterations, buildings attached.

4343. But would you be surprised to hear that that house which pays 11 *l.* 15 *s.* 10 *d.* rent was valued at only 6 *l.* in the valuation of 1828?—Yes, it would rather surprise me.

4344. Now then, assuming for a moment that the valuation is such as I have described in those two instances, can you state the valuation in 1828 was too low, supposing it is true that the valuation of those two houses was 6 *l.* only; can you so describe that valuation, can you give it that character, that it was too high?—I should think that an error of two houses in the valuation of 1,000 would not give a general character.

4345. Now do you know the house of William Hurley of Bagwell-street?—Yes.

4346. What do you take to be the value of that house?—With regard to some of those houses you will take my answers as a guess or conjecture, unless I was in the house; from the position of Hurley's house, I should say that a house in that position, even though small, ought to be 12 *l.*; I take that as a guess.

4347. Then you would not be surprised to hear it was 14 *l.*?—No, I would not be surprised to hear that a house in the position of that house was 14 *l.*, even though small.

4348. Now suppose that that was valued at only 7 *l.* in this very high valuation of 1828; these things may occur although you are not aware of them?—I am speaking of the valuation being high; I am speaking of the general feeling expressed to myself by the persons who came to look at the books.

4349. I believe, from your experience in these matters, you have never known a valuation of any description put on a man's property against his will, that he was not disposed to consider as too high; you cannot say, from your experience of such things, but that people generally consider the valuation put on property with a view to taxation as anything but too high?—I know that people in general thought it was too high, both as to value and as to the consequences they thought it might produce, and there would have been many more appeals against the valuation but for my showing them that though the valuation was even higher than its intrinsic worth, yet if the relative value was kept up all through, that it would not raise their taxation more, if the relative value was kept up. The reduction of the valuation generally put would be unfavourable to those who valued high, that is in the scale above 20 *l.*, than it would to the other, because it would throw persons of 20 *l.* into the second class, and reduce the scale of that taxation, and also that of 10 *l.*, and throw the 5 *l.* out altogether by reducing it in a regular scale.

4350. Chairman.] With regard to all these instances that you have been speaking

- speaking to latterly, are the same parties in the houses now that were in at the period of 1828?—I believe so.
4351. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] I believe I am correct in representing all those three persons as still occupying the same premises?—No; Joshua Moore was not in that occupation when the valuation was made; it is only recently that he has taken it.
4352. But he was there when he registered?—Yes.
4353. And he still occupies the house out of which he registered?—Yes, I believe so.
4354. *Chairman.*] Were these houses in the same condition then as now?—I cannot say.
4355. Were the houses in that street, or were these particular houses as valuable in 1828 as in 1837?—I think they are rather more valuable now; I think all the houses for business in Clonmel are rather increasing in value than decreasing, and have been since that period.
4356. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But I believe there has been no very sensible or considerable improvement in Clonmel since 1828?—I think there has been a considerable improvement; a number of new houses built.
4357. But the building of new houses, I believe, has not the direct effect of increasing the value of the old houses; the greater the number of houses in the market, if I may use the term, I presume the more the value of houses is decreased?—When I speak of new houses, I do not mean those intended for business; but I say there has been a greater demand for houses in a position for doing business in the shopkeeping way in Clonmel; that there is a greater demand at present, and for the last year or so, than there was in 1828.
4358. And there have been new houses built?—There have been new houses built.
4359. Do you know anything about whether the population is increasing or not?—I can only judge of that from the census.
4360. Then you do not know?—I do not know from my own knowledge.
4361. You cannot form any guess of the actual number of houses in Clonmel?—I cannot.
4362. Were you one of the persons who went lately to value some houses?—I went to look at some houses.
4363. With a view to ascertain their value?—Yes.
4364. You were accompanied, I believe, by Mr. Smith and Mr. Higgins?—I was in company one evening with Mr. Higgins; I do not know whether I have been with Mr. Smith, but I think not.
4365. Do you know the house of John Sawyer in the Irishtown?—I do.
4366. I believe you went there to look at his premises?—I did.
4367. Now you valued his premises; put a value on them on that occasion?—No, I do not think I did.
4368. You formed no estimate at all of the value of the premises?—I formed an estimate from what the man told me himself.
4369. What value did you put upon it from what he told you himself?—He told me that he paid 10 *l.*, and that he thought it was too much.
4370. I wish to know what value you put?—I coincided with his opinion, and believed he paid 10 *l.* for it; and I agreed with him that I thought it too much; that it was rather high.
4371. Did you make any other observation as to what you considered the value?—No, I did not.
4372. Did either Smith or Higgins make any observation upon the occasion?—Smith was not there.
4373. Mr. Higgins was?—Yes.
4374. Did he make any observation?—Similar to what I have said now; and that he agreed with the person that it was too much.
4375. Have you a distinct recollection of having said that those premises were not worth 5 *l.* a year?—No, indeed I did not; if I said they were not worth 5 *l.* I should say what was very wrong.
4376. Did Higgins say that in your presence?—No, he did not.
4377. And you can state positively that was not said on that occasion?—That is not said; that they were not worth 5 *l.*; I could not say it.
4378. Did you say anything about their value being broken, or some such a case as that?—No.
4379. Nor did Higgins?—Not to my knowledge.

Mr. Richard Legge.

17 April 1837.

Mr. Richard Legge.
17 April 1837.

4380. Do you happen to know who registered Sawyer; which of the barrister
—I cannot say whether he was registered by Hobson or by Howley.
4381. But it was by the one or the other?—Yes; he was not residing in
that place at the registry in 1832; I believe it was Mr. Howley; I would rather
say it was Mr. Howley. The place I consider as being a good situation for his
business, and that probably he had to induce the man who let it to him to give
it to him; and I consider when the man paid 10*l.* for it, of course it must have
been of the value of 10*l.*
4382. Now, Mr. Hobson; I believe you were all satisfied with his registry?
—Yes, I never heard any complaint.
4383. Do you know that, in point of fact, Mr. Hobson allowed or registered
claimants whose rent did not come up to 10*l.*?—I make no doubt but he did.
4384. Do you recollect the case of Thomas Holmes in the Irishtown, tailor?
—Yes.
4385. Do you remember what his rent was?—I think eight guineas he told
me he paid.
4386. Are you quite clear upon that, upon recollection?—I think so.
4387. Do not you think it was only four?—No, I should think he would get
it for four in the Irishtown, Clonmel; in that thoroughfare, he would not get
a house in that situation for four; it is not a good house or a large one, but it is
the thoroughfare for business that makes the house of more value.
4388. However, his rent was not 10*l.*?—It was not; he told us so.
4389. And Mr. Hobson registered?—I presume so; it was by Mr. Hobson.
4390. That he was registered?—Yes.
4391. Now, Walter Bowles, of Upper Johnston-street; do you know his pre-
mises?—Yes.
4392. Do you know what his rent is?—I cannot say I know his rent.
4393. You do not know, then, that it was only 6*l.*?—It might be but 6*l.*,
though the house is worth more than that, for I have known him live in it for the
last 25 or 26 years.
4394. Do you mean to say his house is worth more than the rent he paid for
it?—I do, if he paid only 6*l.*
4395. If he only paid 6*l.* a year, you admit that may be the case?—I have
admitted that all through.
4396. And although no fine was paid?—I speak of houses now to be let,
houses in the market; I did not speak of houses let 10 or 12 years ago, when the
tenant might have had some advantage by length of time, but I speak of houses
in the market.
4397. You knew Walter Bowles's house was under 10*l.* when he registered
—I do not think his house is worth 10*l.* now.
4398. Now, was he not registered by Mr. Hobson?—He was.
4399. Then neither was his rent 10*l.*, nor is the house worth 10*l.*?—I think
not; that is my opinion of it.
4400. Now, let me ask as to Mr. Howley; I think you told me you were all
very well satisfied with Mr. Howley's registering?—I have not seen much of it,
but I can judge from those who were admitted, as well as those who were
present.
4401. Is it not the general impression of the people in Clonmel that Mr.
Howley's registry was a fair one?—Yes, I believe so; I heard all parties ex-
press themselves highly pleased with Mr. Howley's conduct on the bench.
4402. Is Sawyer living now?—I saw him the day before I left.
4403. And occupying the same premises?—He was in the premises when
I was speaking to him.
4404. *Chairman.*] What is his occupation?—A victualler.
4405. Mr. Serjeant *Balk.*] Do you know Richard Tobin, occupying a cellar
under Mr. Skulley, in Dublin-street?—I do not think you will find such a name
as that on the registry; it will be in next year's registry.
4406. Sir *Robert Ferguson.*] When was he registered?—At the last registry.
4407. Mr. Serjeant *Balk.*] He was registered?—I heard so.
4408. He was registered out of a cellar?—He was.
4409. Do you know what his rent was?—I heard it was between 8*l.* and 9*l.*
4410. Well, and he was registered by Mr. Howley?—He was, so I heard.
4411. Now do not you know that, in point of fact, it occasionally happens
Clonmel, that a landlord will deduct something from the rent which he was
other

otherwise require, from a tenant of good character and industrious habits?—
I do not.

4412. You do not think that that ever occurs?—I think the landlord lets his house to what person he conceives to be a solvent tenant, and does not let it to a person whom he does not conceive to be a solvent tenant.

4413. Is not there such a thing as a difference between the solvency and the respectability and the industry of different applicants for premises?—There may.

4414. But is there not, in point of fact?—There may in some cases.

4415. Mr. O'Connell.] There may be a difference of character?—Yes, a difference of character as to sobriety.

4416. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And solvency?—And solvency.

4417. And do you mean to say that, in your judgment, a landlord would just as soon let his premises to the man of indifferent character for solvency, as to the man of good character for solvency?—Indeed he would not.

4418. Then supposing a man of extremely good character for solvency were to present himself, would not the landlord be inclined to take from that man rather a lower rent than from a man whose solvency was not equally good?—He would.

4419. And do not you believe, in point of fact, it frequently happens that landlords do take a lower rent from persons of the character I describe, of undoubted solvency and respectability of character, than they would otherwise demand?—I would be inclined to do so myself; but I do not say that landlords in general do it; I rather think they look for too much, that they run the risk.

4420. Chairman.] What per-centage would you take off the rent, as between a very good tenant and an indifferent one?—I cannot speak as to that; I have not known instances of it.

4421. Would you prefer, very often, the whole of your house unoccupied to letting it to a bad tenant?—I certainly cannot form the scale.

4422. Would you prefer letting your house to a bad tenant to keeping it unoccupied?—I would not set it to a bad one at all; I would sooner keep it idle.

4423. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then I believe the result of what you have been stating I may state to be this: that the three registering barristers in Clonmel, two of whom, at least, namely Howley and Hobson, gave complete satisfaction; that those three registering barristers were in the habit of registering men as voters whose rent was under 10 l.?—I think you said, "in the habit?"

4424. Occasionally, I ought to have said?—That they have done so in very few instances.

4425. Now when you say very few instances, should you be surprised to hear that this has occurred in 125 instances?—I do not believe it.

4426. Then you would be surprised to hear it?—I would be astonished; I should say on the whole registry there are not 125 under the value of 10 l., according to my own valuation.

4427. Then I believe we are agreed; I am questioning you as to what was done by the three, and you say then, now you would not be surprised to hear that what was done by the three upon the whole registry, taking into account what was done by the three registering barristers, as many as 125 instances may have occurred in which the claimants did not pay 10 l. a year rent?—I think that is too great an estimate.

4428. But you do not consider there could be so many?—There are not so many to my knowledge and belief.

4429. Have you looked through the registry?—Frequently.

4430. And with a view to your examination now?—Yes.

4431. Well then, did you make any calculation of the numbers that appeared?—I did not count them, but I could make a tolerable conjecture, I think, as to the number of under value.

4432. I am not speaking of 10 l. a year value, according to your estimate of it?—But that is what I speak of; I speak of my own estimate.

4433. I am speaking to you merely of the rent paid by the claimants, and have been asking you about the practice of the registering barristers to register claimants as voters whose rent did not amount to 10 l. a year. Then I asked you whether you would be surprised to hear there were 125 instances in which voters had registered where their rent did not amount to 10 l. a year?—That is, the rent they paid; there may be that number. I know there are some men who have leases of their premises and who paid fines, whose rent is considerably over 10 l., and yet they would now let for over 20 l.

Mr. Richard Legg.

17 April 1837.

4434. *Chairman.*] You have already stated that you have gone through the registry to ascertain the number of houses you conceive to be under the value of 10 l.; how many such cases are you prepared to state appear to you to exist?—I should think about 50.

4435. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] In how many instances had you gone into the houses; what number, what portion of the 50 had you actually examined the houses?—I suppose in most of them; I have been in them; perhaps I might not have gone into them for this purpose, having a previous knowledge; having been in them perhaps numbers of years ago.

4436. Then of course if it was only numbers of years ago that you were in them, you cannot tell what improvement has taken place?—I speak generally; I speak of the whole list under value.

4437. But attend to me; I ask you, out of the 50 cases in which you state that, in your judgment, the premises were not worth 10 l., in how many instances were you actually within the houses for the purpose of valuing and ascertaining the rent?—I could not answer that.

4438. Do you think you were in 40 out of the 50?—That is within the last three or four years.

4439. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Yes; you went in there for the purpose of valuing?—No, I did not go into many of them for the purpose of valuing; but I had been in some of them previously, and it was not necessary.

4440. That was some years ago?—Yes, and lately.

4441. For the purpose of valuing?—And not for the purpose of valuing; I have been in them.

4442. I want you to confine yourself to cases in which you went into the premises for the purpose of valuing; did you go into 20 out of 50, for the purpose of valuing?—No.

4443. Did you go into 10?—I believe I should say I did; I might have gone into about 10.

4444. You might, but I want to know how many you did?—I could not say the number; if you were to ask me to particular cases, I might answer you then.

4445. I want you to give me your recollection and belief upon that point; do you believe you went into 10 of those houses for the purpose of valuing, as may as 10?—I am certain I did.

4446. Within what period?—Within the period since the first election; and more than ten; I went in then for the purpose of valuing some of them, and I went in since.

4447. Now, I want to call your attention to those cases in which you have gone in since and recently, and by that I mean within the last two or three months; have you gone into any within the last two or three months?—I have.

4448. How many; were you in 10 of those houses, for the purpose of valuing them, within the last two or three months?—No.

4449. Were you in five?—I think I was.

4450. Are you sure you were in five?—I think I was.

4451. But are you sure, are you quite sure, in five?—Yes, I am sure in five.

4452. Now, be so good as specify the five?—I was in Sawyer's; I was in Holmes's; I was in Norris's; I was in Sanford's; I was in a person's of the same of Harwood.

4453. *Chairman.*] What is Harwood's christian name, do you know; Edward?—Edward.

4454. He is a painter and glazier?—Yes.

4455. Mary-street; is that it?—Yes.

4456. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Were you asked any questions about Norris; were you examined about Norris?—No.

4457. Have you been examined about Sanford?—No.

4458. Or Harwood?—No.

4459. Now, then, out of the 50 instances in which, in your judgment, the premises are not worth 10 l. a year appearing upon that registry, you have examined five of the premises; is not that so?—That is, recently.

4460. Then as to the remaining 45, you speak from conjecture, not from actual knowledge?—I do not say that.

4461. Well, what do you speak from?—Knowledge had previously to that.

4462. That is to say, knowledge acquired in some instances three or four years ago?—And in other instances later than that.

4463. But you cannot specify in how many instances your knowledge has been acquired later, that is to say, within the last three or four years, and in what instances your knowledge was had only three or four months ago; can you distinguish the one class from the other?—Not without reference to individual cases.

4464. Well, can you state in what proportion of the 50 cases you were in the premises for the purpose of valuing them three or four years ago, or at any period?—No, I could not state.

4465. Do you think you were in, that you went to the premises for the purpose of valuing them, that you entered one half (25), we will say, at any time?—For the mere purpose of valuing?

4466. For the purpose of valuing?—No, not for the mere purpose of valuing.

4467. Do you think you went into 20 of them at any time for the purpose of valuing?—Not for the purpose of valuing I did not.

4468. Do you think you went into 10?—I think I did, I am not sure.

4469. Mr. O'Connell.] Are you sure you went into five?—I have answered that.

4470. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But am I to understand the witness to say he is not sure that at any time he went into as many as 10 of these 50 for the purpose of valuing?—I am not certain; I believe I did for the purpose of valuing.

4471. Now, could you favour me then with the names of as many as you recollect, where you did go for the purpose of valuing at any time, in addition to the five I have taken down?—I went into Michael Connors', of George's-court.

4472. How many years ago is that?—It was subsequent to the first election.

4473. But how long subsequent should you say?—I suppose about this time four years.

4474. About four years ago?—Yes; I should think so.

4475. Well, what other; can you remember any other?—I went into Edward Machin's, of Irishtown.

4476. Was that about the same time?—Yes.

4477. Any more?—Richard O'Mara.

4478. About the same time?—Yes.

4479. Do you remember any other?—Michael Russell's.

4480. At the same time?—At the same time.

4481. Any more?—Timothy Dooly.

4482. Any more?—I cannot recollect the names of them, unless I had something to bring them to my recollection.

4483. Then those are the only houses which you at any time entered for the purpose of valuing them, in addition to the five?—Which I can recollect to have entered.

4484. So that with the exception of the houses of those persons you have mentioned in those two classes, I believe I am correct in saying you have no actual knowledge of value?—I can now remember others.

4485. Mr. Hamilton.] I have a list of them here, and therefore perhaps I had better ask him; Patrick Burke, Dispensary-street; were you in that house?—I had sufficient knowledge without going into it; I did not go into it; I saw the rear of it.

4486. Andrew Armstrong, Irishtown?—No, I consider that the same as Mackin's.

4487. Mr. O'Connell.] The question is, whether you went in for the purpose of valuing?—

4488. Mr. Hamilton.] Patrick Burke, Dispensary-street?—There are two.

4489. Were you in either?—I was not in either.

4490. Thomas Boyd, Duckett-street?—I was in that.

4491. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] When were you in that?—At the same time, about four years ago.

4492. Mr. Hamilton.] William Carew, of Dispensary-street; were you in that? I cannot remember going into that at that time.

4493. Patrick Callaghan, Slatery's-lane?—My evidence, with regard to that, was based on the commissioners' books.

4494. The general question is, were you in the following houses for the purpose of valuing them, since 1828; that is the general question; yes, or no, will serve

Mr. Richard Legger.

17 April 1837.

as an answer to it. William Davis, New-street?—No, I was not in that house for the purpose of valuing.

4495. John Carey, Ducket-street?—I was in that this time four years.

4496. Daniel English, Johason-street?—I am not quite certain as to his having been in it.

4497. Thomas Kelly, Gravel Walks?—I was not in that.

4498. Nicolas Lynch?—I was not in that; I examined it otherwise, but was not in it; I was at the rear of it.

4499. Thomas Mackie, White's-lane?—I was not in that.

4500. Gerrard Russell, of Peter-street?—I cannot say as to that.

4501. John Ryan, Ducket-street?—I was in that.

4502. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] When?—At the same time.

4503. Mr. Hamilton.] James Wholohan, in Ducket-street?—I was in that four years ago.

4504. Thomas Sheehy, Blind-street?—I was not in that.

4505. Michael Skiffington, Shambles-lane; were you in that?—I was, four years ago.

4506. Thomas Walsh?—I was not in that; I looked in through the gate; it has an open large gateway to it.

4507. William Gorman, Bagwell-street?—I could see into the whole of that; I was not in it.

4508. John Coghlan, cooper?—I am not certain about being in that house.

4509. Timothy Carew, Cherry-tree-lane?—I was in that, within the last month.

4510. James Smith, Richmond-street?—I was not in that.

4511. Michael Tobin?—Nor in that.

4512. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] When you said you were in Timothy Carew's within the last month, do you mean for the purpose of valuing?—It was.

4513. Mr. Hamilton.] John Thomas, Hopkins'-lane?—I was in that.

4514. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] That was four years ago?—Yes, it was four years ago.

4515. Mr. Hamilton.] John Kenae, Bagwell-street?—I did not go into that.

4516. Martin Callaghan?—I did not go into that for the purpose of valuing it.

4517. Martin Morony?—I did not go into that for the purpose of valuing it.

4518. Denis Shohan?—I did not go into that house.

4519. Am I to understand you to say, that though you have not been in those houses for the purpose of valuing, you have no hesitation in giving evidence respecting them from your general knowledge?—From my general knowledge, and from having been in them; I might have been in some of them for other purposes besides that of valuing; I confine myself to going into them for the purpose of valuing.

4520. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then as to those you give a guess?—I made the best guess I could; some of them I have been in, but not for the purpose of valuing.

4521. Then as to all that you did not enter for the purpose of valuing, any evidence you have given is guess-work, conjecture?—I do not say that; it does not follow; I might have had previous knowledge of the houses from going into them.

4522. And so if you did not go there for the purpose of valuing, do you mean to say that the judgment you formed at a subsequent period is anything but conjecture?—I do not agree with that.

4523. What is it then?—I may have a knowledge of houses.

4524. I am not speaking of what you may have, but what you had in point of fact?—I had knowledge of some of them.

4525. Will you specify those that you had knowledge of when you had not gone there for the purpose of valuing?—I cannot without reference to particular instances. I could not make a classification; that never entered my head before.

4526. Then the classification that did enter your head, was one that you did not take into account; you had not any actual knowledge of the premises, because you cannot specify which you had an actual knowledge of and which you had not, so that you formed a classification of the houses without being conscious the time you had any actual knowledge of either; I am speaking of that class

where you did not enter for the purpose of valuing?—I entered some for the purpose of valuing.

4527. I am not speaking of those?—I say I had knowledge of others from having been in them.

4528. Some of them?—Some of them, from having been in them, but I had not gone to them for the purpose of valuing, being satisfied with the knowledge that I had obtained; and I did not go into some of them taking one as a class for others in the same street, and that I considered of the same extent of building and ground.

4529. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know the house of Thomas Mackie, White's-lane?—I did not know the house; I spoke of Thomas Mackie from being present, at his registry; the description he gave of the place himself.

4530. State what description he gave of it at the time of the registry?—He stated he had a room or two, for which he paid 1s. 6d. a week.

4531. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] That was in 1832?—Yes.

4532. That is five years ago?—Yes.

4533. And now you are giving us an accurate statement of evidence that was given five years ago?—I am giving it from memory. I believe I mentioned the case before, before the Committee of the House.

4534. Mr. O'Connell.] Is he in the house still, do you know?—I cannot say.

4535. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you know whether his name is on the registry?—His name remains on the registry, of course. He may have been dead, and yet his name on the registry.

4536. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you know whether he voted?—I know he did.

4537. Who did he vote for?—Mr. Ronayne.

4538. On both occasions?—On both occasions. He was asked for how he accounted that the house was worth to him 10*l.*, and he said that he made it by rearing pheasants. I cannot speak to his house, only from his own statement of it.

4539. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know the house of Gerrard Russell, in Peter-street?—I do.

4540. Are you aware of the rent that he pays?—Yes.

4541. How much?—He does not pay it now; he is dead.

4542. Well, what rent did he pay?—*£*. 8.

4543. Mr. O'Connell.] How do you know that?—From his landlord.

4544. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Who is his landlord?—Mr. Burke.

4545. What is he by trade?—A cloth merchant.

4546. Who did he vote for?—He voted for Mr. Bagwell.

4547. Mr. Hamilton.] Then you value his house at 8*l.*, I presume?—Yes, 8*l.* There were three houses of the same size: my brother lived in one of them, for which he paid 8*l.* to the same landlord.

4548. Mr. O'Connell.] Is your brother a voter?—No.

4549. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know the house of Michael Skiffington, Shambles-lane; are you acquainted with that house?—Yes, I was in it.

4550. What value do you set upon it?—I consider it to be worth between 7*l.* and 8*l.*; not more.

4551. Is he a voter?—He is.

4552. Do you consider it worth only 7*l.* or 8*l.*?—I do not consider it worth more: I do not think he pays near that rent for it. He voted for Mr. Bagwell.

4553. Do you know the house of Michael Tobin, brogue-maker?—The house has been thrown down since. I believe it is two years since it was thrown down.

4554. What value do you conceive that house was?—I considered as I viewed it from the outside; it was a very narrow house, not more than 10 feet in front, and about 12 feet in height, and I went to the rear of it, and I saw that there was a similar house built to it in the rear. It had a garden of the same breadth as the house, but considerably longer; I suppose there might be about 10 perches in the garden.

4555. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You were not in the house?—No, I was not in the house, but I saw the whole extent by going to the rear of it; the rent he paid for it was 6*l.* 10*s.*; I considered the house worth 8*l.* a year.

4556. He is not there now?—No, he is registered out of a house worth 10*l.* and more since that.

4557. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know the house of John Kenne, yeoman, 13well-street?—I do.

Mr. Richard Legge.

17 April 1837.

4558. What do you conceive its value was?—I considered it worth 7 l.
4559. He was a voter?—He was, and voted for Mr. Bagwell.
4560. Are you aware of any instance in which persons who are lodgers or weekly tenants have been registered?—Yes.
4561. Are you acquainted with William Meagher, of Bagwell-street?—Yes, I was in the place; I went to view that in 1833.
4562. Were you in court when he was registered?—I do not remember that I was.
- 4563-4. Do you know he was a lodger at the time of his being registered?—Yes, he must have been a lodger.
4565. *Chairman.*] What was he, a boot-maker?—A wheelwright.
4566. *Sir Robert Ferguson.*] How do you know he was a lodger?—Because his landlord lived in the house.
4567. *Chairman.*] Who was his landlord?—James Dunn.
4568. How did you know he was the landlord of the house?—I know the house was his; that he received it by inheritance. I knew his aunt to live in it for 20 years; she was a very old woman; he succeeded her in the ownership of the house.
4569. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Your only reason for knowing Meagher is a lodger is, that his landlord lived in the house; is not that so?—That is just so; and I cannot conceive a stronger one.
4570. Do you see any impossibility in the landlord letting the house to Meagher, and then lodging in it so let?—I could not conceive that, unless the landlord had left it, and set the whole house.
4571. Supposing he did leave it; for anything you can tell, he did leave, and let the whole house to Meagher, and then lodged with him; that may have happened, may it not; is not that possible?—I think it is improbable.
4572. And your only reason for stating Meagher is a lodger is, that his landlord lived in the house?—That his landlord lived in the house, and had the entrance to his room through Meagher's room.
4573. There was no other entrance?—There was a back door; but if you come in back or front, you would pass through Meagher's room to go up Dunn's stairs; the stairs were out in the room, not in the passage.
4574. *Mr. O'Connell.*] But the entrance was into Meagher's premises?—Yes; Meagher had the lower part, but the staircase was just as if it were in this room; not distinctly shut out.
4575. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Then, in point of fact, there is no out entrance into Dunn's part?—No, except through Meagher's part; I heard that Dunn went to register before Mr. Hobson, out of this house, and he was objected to on the ground of another person having been already registered out of the house.
4576. So that the landlord was rejected?—Rejected at the subsequent registry.
4577. And the person you call the lodger was received?—No, the lodger had been at the first registration; and the landlord did not apply to register until the subsequent registry.
4578. *Mr. O'Connell.*] So that there was but one person registered out of that house?—The house is gone completely; the Bank of Ireland now stands on the site.
4579. There was but one?—There was but one.
4580. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Are you acquainted with Patrick Welch, of William-street?—Yes.
4581. Was he a lodger at the time of his registration?—I cannot say; in that case there were two registered out of the same house, and which was landlord and which was tenant I cannot say.
4582. State the name of the second.—The second is Pollard.
4583. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] What is his christian name?—I think, William.
4584. *Chairman.*] Was not Pollard a tailor?—He was.
4585. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Had they a common entrance?—There was but one; entrance from the street.
4586. *Chairman.*] No. 18, William-street, is the residence of Welch, is it not?—Yes. The numbers of the houses differ from that registry. It does not appear from the registry that they registered out of the same house.
4587. Who lives in No. 19?—I cannot say now who is residing in it; but Pollard did not reside in it at the time, nor Welch; they resided in 18.
4588. De

4588. Does not Pollard appear on the registry as registering out of No. 19, William-street?—He does. Mr. Richard Legge.
4589. Can you account for that?—I cannot, because it is certainly incorrect. 17 April 1837.
4590. You do not know now who lives in No. 19?—I do not.
4591. What is No. 19, as to value?—It is a house worth about 16*l.* or 17*l.* a year.
4592. What is No. 18, as to value?—No. 18 is a very good house, a front house, and at the rear there is one common entrance.
4593. What is the whole value of the house No. 18, William-street?—It ought to be worth 16*l.* a-year.
4594. Not 20*l.*?—I do not think it is worth 20*l.*
4595. Not the whole premises of No. 18, William-street?—No, I do not think it is.
4596. Mr. Hamilton.] But you are aware of the fact that they both resided in the same house at the time of the registry?—Yes.
4597. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] What is your knowledge of that fact?—I know Welch's father built the house, and that he then resided in it.
4598. That the father did?—No, the father was dead.
4599. I asked you what were your means of knowledge?—From seeing them myself in the house; seeing both Welch and Pollard. They were brothers-in-law; Pollard married Welch's sister. Pollard had his name on the window as a tailor.
4600. You have been there?—Yes.
4601. You saw them living there?—I did.
4602. Mr. Hamilton.] Now as to Dennis Slattery, of Johnson-street?—I know the house that he registered out of. I did not go to examine it, but I went by his evidence, his own statement at the registry.
4603. What was the nature of his evidence at the registry?—He said he had a room in Mr. Comerford's house.
4604. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Were you present?—I was.
4605. Chairman.] Well, anything more?—He was asked what rent he paid for it, and he refused to answer the question when first asked; on being pressed, he said he paid no rent. He was asked then if he paid no rent, what equivalent does he give, or did he give anything in any way for the room; and he said that there might be something 'incontinent' in the question, and he would not answer it.
4606. Well, he was registered?—He was, and voted.
4607. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know William Purcell, of Gordon-street?—Yes.
4608. State the circumstances under which he was registered?—Two persons were registered out of that house.
4609. Name the other?—John Garven.
4610. Chairman.] State what John Garven is.—A servant.
4611. Now state the case.—Two persons registered and vote out of that house.
4612. Mr. Hamilton.] Is there more than one entrance?—No.
4613. Are you aware which is the landlord, and which the lodger?—I have heard the house belongs to a Mr. Baker.
4614. Chairman.] Did you hear this from Mr. Baker?—I heard it from his son.
4615. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then you did not hear it from Mr. Baker?—No, because he was dead.
4616. Chairman.] Well, was the son who gave you this information with regard to the house cognizant of the facts of the occupation?—I believe he was.
4617. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Was he the landlord?—I should state the circumstances.
4618. You can answer "Yes" or "No;" was he the landlord, the son who gave you this information?—I cannot answer that question until I give an explanation of the circumstances in which the house was at the time, because I do not know whether the son was landlord or not. I said that Mr. Baker (I speak of the gentleman who was dead at the time) was the proprietor or owner of the house. He had the house at too high a rent: he had a lease of it, and he wished to get rid of the house, not to leave it to his children as a legacy at too high

Mr. Richard Leggett.

17 April 1837.

high a rent; and I heard that it was made over to this Purcell, who was then in his employment, either by assignment or will, I do not know which.

4619. You heard this?—Yes.

4620. You do not know from whom you heard it?—It was a thing generally spoken of through the town; Purcell registered out of the house; the house has since been given up; young Mr. Baker had to put the house in repair, and he gave the landlord a sum of money to take it off his hands?—Purcell's right was thrown aside.

4621. Then there is an end to that?—Yes, there is an end to that.

4622. In the case of Slattery of Johnson-street, who you say registered out of a room, was there any objection made as to his time of registry?—Nothing but the cross-examination.

4623. Well, but was there an objection made; was the barrister pressed not to register him?—He was.

4624. On what ground?—On the ground that the man himself said it was a room, and his own evidence was inconsistent.

4625. He said it was a room?—Yes.

4626. What did the barrister say to that?—I believe, as well as I can remember, the man said that he had the hall-door to himself; that he could enter by the hall-door.

4627. That he had the exclusive use of the hall-door?—Yes.

4628. So that that was his evidence?—It was, as far as I remember.

4629. And was that contradicted?—No, it was not; I do not know how it could be contradicted, when a man sets himself down, and he is published in a paper as a householder, and there is no such householder to be seen, what evidence can be given to contradict it.

4630. I asked you was there any evidence to contradict his statement that he had the exclusive use of the hall-door?—There was not; I only state my belief as to his stating about the entrance.

4631. Now in the case of Patrick Welch and Pollard, who you say registered out of the same house, was there any objection made at the time of the registry as to that?—I cannot say; I do not recollect being present; I cannot say that I was present.

4632. Then all you know of your own knowledge is, that the two lived in the same house?—That they lived in the same house.

4633. Are those votes still continue?—Yes, they are on the book.

4634. Are they still living there?—They are living, but I do not know whether they are living there; Welch I believe is living there.

4635. But you do not know whether Pollard is living there?—Pollard is now living there; I believe he had left it and is gone back to it again.

4636. Mr. Hamilton.] Now as to Patrick Tunpey, mason?—He lives in a house in Mary-street that is let out in tenements to different lodgers.

4637. Is he himself a lodger?—He is; so his landlord told me.

4638. Who is his landlord?—Mr. Davis.

4639. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] What is Mr. Davis?—He is in the china-ware and grocery business.

4640. Who did he vote for?—He did not vote for any one; he is entitled to a vote, but he would not register it; he is a freeman; he is entitled to vote as a householder too, if his registry were claimed; he is not registered as a freeman, and therefore he could not vote.

4641. But of course he is in the interest of Mr. Bagwell as a freeman?—I do not think he served his interest by not registering; he may wish him well, but it is a very bad way of showing it.

4642. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know what rent Mr. Patrick Tunpey paid?—Mr. Davis told me he paid 9 s. a month.

4643. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then all you know about Patrick Tunpey is what you heard from his landlord?—From his landlord, and from knowing he occupies that place.

4644. How do you know it?—I have been in his room.

4645. You know he occupies some part of the premises?—Yes, and I know he does not occupy the whole, for I have been with several other persons in the same house; in fact there was a printing-office in it at the time of the registry.

4646. Do you say he occupies more than one room?—Yes, I believe he occupies two rooms; he may occupy a third for aught I know.

4647. Do

4647. Do you know for whom he voted?—Yes, for Mr. Ronayne.
4648. Mr. Hamilton.] Now do you know the premises occupied by Edward and John Darnay?—I do.
4649. State the circumstance under which they were registered.—The two registered out of the one house.
4650. Have they but one entrance?—There are two entrances to the house; they were father and son; Edward Darnay the father is dead; the son has the sole occupation of the house now.
4651. John Hayes; do you know his house?—I do the house he lives in.
4652. Is he a lodger?—He is; there are several lodgers in the same house; he is not the only one.
4653. John Hayes, Warner-street?—Yes.
4654. Do you know what rent he pays?—No, I do not.
4655. Chairman.] A shoemaker he is; who is the landlord of the house?—There are two landlords to the house; I believe they had it jointly, Walter Keating and Robert Hogan.
4656. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Have you brought the vestry book with you?—No.
4657. You have not?—No.
4658. What is the book in which the applotments appear?—The rate books.
4659. They are in your custody, are they?—They are.
4660. You have not brought them either?—I brought one.
4661. Mr. O'Connell.] Why did not you bring more than one?—I brought the last one.
4662. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] What period does that cover?—It is the applotment for the county cess, and was paid up to the last assizes.
4663. I am not speaking of the county cess, the town cess under the 9th Geo. 4?—That is not in my custody.
4664. In whose custody is it?—That is in the custody of Mr. Keily; he was my successor to that office.
4665. But is not there an applotment distinct from the valuation?—There is; the valuation is copied out.
4666. Where is that?—That is also in his possession; it belongs to his office; he makes out the rate from the valuation.
4667. For what purpose did you bring this one book that you speak of?—I brought it with me lest it might be wanted.
4668. I want to know why you selected this particular book, the last book of the county cess; what have you to do with it?—As vestry clerk I have to do with it in the borough of Clonmel.
4669. You have brought the last of those books?—Yes.
4670. And that covered, you say, I think, the last assizes?—It is the last one that I made out.
4671. And have you made any use of that in comparing it to give evidence?—No, I have not; any information about it I had myself without it.
4672. Why did you bring the book if you had all the information without it?—I brought the book lest it might be wanted; there might be some question perhaps as to my evidence, and I might refer to that to corroborate my own statement if it were necessary.
4673. Sir Robert Ferguson.] How is the county cess laid on the town of Clonmel; is it applotted on the town of Clonmel by a sworn valuation?—It is laid on by applotters appointed by the vestry.
4674. How do they value the houses; do they value the houses at a rack-rent, or follow the former applotments?—They generally follow the former applotments, making such corrections as may seem right from the change of circumstances, either as to the value of the house or from their differing from the former persons who had gone over it.
4675. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Is it not the fact that the applotters, generally speaking, though they transcribe what they find in the old books, do not value the houses over again for the purpose of new applotments?—There is no standard valuation by which they go.
4676. Would not you call that valuing at random?—Pretty much so, according to their own knowledge of the houses in the town.
4677. And I believe the result is, that houses valued 20 years ago, remain at the same applotment at this day?—No, indeed, they do not.

Mr. Richard Leggs.

4678. Why not?—I told you that they make corrections according to the circumstances, and they take the old books as the foundation.

17 April 1837.

4679. Then they find a valuation in it made 20 years ago?—No, I did not say that.

4680. I am putting that case to you?—No, that cannot be, because it varies every half year.

4681. Then supposing it stood at the same valuation in successive books for the last 20 years; are there cases of that description?—No.

4682. Do you mean to say, in every instance the house valuations appear different every half year?—It does, according to the sum laid down; it may differ.

4683. But do you mean to tell me this, that in no instance has the same house stood at the same valuation for the last 20 years, although there is not an applotment made every half year?—I do not think there is.

4684. Mr. O'Connell.] You are not asked whether the cess varies, because that always varies with the amount?—It does; and the valuation then is according to the circumstances of the house, whether it be improved or whether it be depreciated in value.

4685. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Have you not told me there was no standard by which they went, and that they value at random?—If there was a standard put, then the old valuation might be what you say.

4686. Not if the houses changed in value in the meantime?—If the houses change in value, they change their rate according to their judgment of the then value of the premises, of the actual value in their view at the time. That is what they do; according to the best of their judgment, according to my opinion.

4687. You told me they had no standard to go by?—When I say they have no standard, I say they have no standard like what they had in the watching and lighting Act, the 9th of Geo. 4, where there is a settled value upon each particular house.

4688. Now, in one word, will you undertake to say that there are no instances in which houses in Clonmel have stood in the several books made out every half year at precisely the same value for the last 15 or 20 years?—I say no instance where the house has changed its value.

4689. I am asking you the general question; will you state now that there are no instances in which houses appear in the several successive books made out half-yearly, in which the applotments appear at the same valuation for the last 15 or 20 years?—There may be houses of that description; but the houses of that description are those which have not changed their value; but where they have changed their value, the rate has been changed in proportion.

4690. Mr. O'Connell.] Have you been concerned about the making of freemen at all?—No.

4691. You were not at all consulted upon that?—No.

4692. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] I think you said you are not a freeman yourself?—I am not a freeman myself.

Mr. George Graham, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Geo. Graham.

4693. Mr. Hamilton.] YOU are a gas proprietor and ironmonger at Clonmel?—Yes.

4694. You attended the registration in the year 1832?—I did, for one or two days.

4695. You were attending also at the time of the valuation of the town, in 1828, under the 9th of Geo. 4, I believe?—Yes, I was.

4696. You have been engaged in putting the gas pipes in the town of Clonmel?—I have half of them only.

4697. That gave you the opportunity of seeing a good deal of the under premises in some parts of the town?—It did a good deal in introducing lights into shops.

4698. You were not examined in 1832, at the time of the registration?—I was not.

4699. Were you in court at any time when persons admitted that they paid not more than 1 s. 6 d. a week?—I was, when they stated that they had not paid more than 1 s. 6 d. a week.

4700. Can you state an instance of any person, a claimant to be registered, who admitted he only paid 1s. 6d. a week?—I am not certain that I can point out any individual, the time is so long since, and I took no note of it; however, I am satisfied that there were two or three cases, but I do not exactly recollect the names at this moment.

4701. *Chairman.*] What of individuals who stated that, and were admitted; is that what you mean?—It is.

4702. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Do you remember the name of any one of them?—Yes; there was a man, I think, named Mackin, a stone-mason.

4703. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] You are not sure?—I am not positive.

4703^a. Of course you are not sure whether the persons are living or dead?—

4704. *Chairman.*] Is Mackin alive now?—He is now living.

4705. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Do you know where he lives now?—I believe he lives in the same lane.

4706. Do you know it?—I know the lane he lives in, but not the house.

4707. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Do you know the premises occupied by John Costello?—I do.

4708. Will you describe those premises?—That is a cellar under George Glascock's in the main street.

4709. How many rooms are there in the cellar; more than one?—There are; there are two or three; I have not been in the rooms, but I have been down in the cellar; other occupations sometimes lead me into those cellars. I have the weights and measures of the town of Clonmel in my care. I am inspector of weights and measures, and sometimes it leads me into those places.

4710. Are you aware of the value of the rooms in that cellar?—The outside value of the whole cellar I take to be not more than about 8*l.* His landlord told me he pays but 7*l.* for it.

4711. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Who is his landlord?—George Glascock.

4712. *Chairman.*] He is a grocer, is he not?—He is.

4713. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Do you know whether John Costello is registered or not?—He did register out of that cellar, and voted.

4714. What business does he follow?—He is a cooper, but I believe his wife sells little huckstry things, small oil-meat, and things of that sort.

4715. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] In addition to his own trade and his wife's, does he not let lodgings also; beds?—I think he does; most of these cellars do let them.

4716. Do you happen to know he has six beds to let?—Indeed I do not, nor do I know the particulars of them.

4717. Do you know the next cellar to Costello's, the next adjoining it?—The very next adjoining is Mr. Hacket's.

4718. Do you know what rent that pays?—I do not.

4719. Should you be surprised to hear he pays 12*l.* a year rent?—Very much so.

4720. Is there a cellar on the other side?—I am not very positive.

4721. *Chairman.*] Is Hacket a bookseller?—He is, and stationer.

4722. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] The situation is a good one, I believe, for trade, is it not?—It is a very good situation.

4723. Is not this cellar of Costello's what you would call a spacious cellar?—It is a very spacious cellar, 34 feet by 20 feet.

4724. And it has a separate entrance, I suppose?—It has a distinct entrance.

4725. *Mr. O'Connell.*] An entrance exclusively belonging to the cellar?—Yes.

4726. And he is a huckster, I suppose?—He is a cooper by trade.

4727. Does he not sell meat also?—He does.

4728. He is a respectable man for his class of life?—He is, for his class of life; for most of those people occupying such premises.

4729. *Mr. Hamilton.*] What is the ordinary charge for a bed in those kind of cellars, by the night?—I really do not know.

4730. *Mr. Leffroy.*] What sort of things are those beds?—I do not know, but I believe they are very middling sort of things; I only suppose so.

4731. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] What is the landlord by trade?—He is a grocer.

4732. Who did he vote for?—He voted for Mr. Bagwell.

4733. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Are you a voter?—I am.

4734. You voted for Mr. Bagwell, I suppose?—I did; he is the only one who ever asked me.

- Mr. Geo. Graham.* 4735. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Do you know the premises of Gerrard Daniel?—Yes, I do.
4736. Will you describe those premises?—It is a cellar in Dublin-street; he is a cooper also.
4737. Is the cellar as spacious as the one you have already described?—It is not.
4738. What do you conceive to be its value?—I think the outside value, according to my estimation, would be about 6*l.* a year.
4739. Did Daniel register?—He did.
4740. Has it a separate entrance from the house above?—It has.
4741. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Do you make then 2*l.* a year difference between that cellar of Daniel and the spacious cellar you described of Costello?—I say the outside value if I say 6*l.*; in point of size, I think there would be more than that difference; the difference of size of cellars in Clonmel, as far as I understand them, do not make so great a difference in their rent.
4742. Then what does?—It is the situation in which it is.
4743. Is Dublin-street as good a situation as Costello's?—I think it is a very excellent situation.
4744. Is it as good a situation as the main street?—I think it is; I think there is very little difference, in point of situation, between the main street and Dublin-street.
4745. Then, the situation being pretty much the same, what is it that decides you in making a difference of 2*l.*?—Because the one is a larger cellar than the other, and it has two windows at the rear and the other has not; it is lighted from two in front.
4746. I think you described Costello's as one of the best?—I did.
4747. Do you know that, in point of fact, Mr. Howley, the present registering barrister, has registered claimants out of cellars as being worth 10*l.*?—Yes.
4748. And Mr. Howley has given satisfaction as registering barrister?—Yes; I did not hear of him in any instance except one, but that is a very peculiar circumstance as far as regards the value of the cellar; it is under Mr. Burke's, and also extends under the street.
4749. But was he registered by Mr. Howley or Mr. Hobson, do you know?—I am not positive.
4750. But you know that, in point of fact, both Howley and Hobson have registered claimants out of cellars as being worth 10*l.* a year?—I believe they have.
4751. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Do you know it of your own knowledge?—Not of my own knowledge.
4752. *Mr. O'Connell.*] But you know it by report?—Yes.
4753. Do you know Richard Tobin's cellar?—No, I do not.
4754. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Do you know the premises of Michael Darcy?—I do.
4755. Is that also a cellar?—It is.
4756. Where is it?—In Dublin-street, nearly opposite the last I was asked about.
4757. What do you conceive to be the value of that cellar?—I should think about 5*l.*, 5*l.* 10*s.*, or 6*l.*
4758. Can you describe the dimensions, as nearly as possible, of that cellar?—In the width it is only about eight feet, but I believe it is about 20 feet deep.
4759. Have these cellars boarded floors?—No, earthen floors.
4760. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] You do not often see boarded floors in a cellar?—No.
4761. Did you ever hear of such a thing?—No, I never did.
4762. It is not even peculiar to Michael Darcy's cellar to have a boarded floor?—No.
4763. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Cellars are usually damp, I believe?—They are under ground apartments.
4764. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Is it usual to board under ground apartments?—Not usual, them sort of apartments in Clonmel.
4765. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Now, as to William Fennell's premises; do you know them?—Yes.
4766. Is

4766. Is that also a cellar?—Yes.
4767. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Where is that?—In the main street.
4768. Mr. Hamilton.] Is it a spacious or a confined cellar?—It is rather spacious.
4769. What value do you set on it?—I think from 6*l.* to 7*l.* ought to be about the value.
4770. Did he register?—He did register.
4771. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Is he living or dead?—He is living.
4772. Mr. Hamilton.] Now, do you know the premises of John Fitzpatrick?—I do.
4773. Describe them?—It is a cellar under Mr. Collett's, in the main street; it is about 15 feet wide, perhaps about 20 or 24 deep, and has no light except through the entrance.
4774. What business does he follow?—That that we call huckstering in Clonmel, selling small offal meat; a bacon seller he is described.
4775. What do you conceive to be the value of those premises?—I should think about 6*l.*
4776. Mr. O'Connell.] When was he registered?—It was just at the first, in December 1832.
4777. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you know when William Fennell was registered?—At the same time.
4778. Mr. Hamilton.] Dennis Grady; are his premises a cellar also?—It is a cellar also, similarly circumstanced.
4779. The same value?—About the same value.
4780. Mr. Lefroy.] Similarly circumstanced, as to having no other light but through the entrance, and about the same dimensions?—Yes.
4781. Now what is the height of these cellars generally?—Some of them are as much as eight feet, and some not more than six and a half; from six and a half to seven and a half is the general height.
4782. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Any great comfort or luxury is not looked for in these cellars?—I believe not.
4783. The use of these cellars is not to administer either to the luxury or the comforts of the inmates, but to enable them to make money?—It is a class of industrious people, generally, that occupy them.
4784. And I believe the inmates are just as well able to make money by the sale of provisions in the cellars, without a great height, or without a great deal of light from the window?—I conceive they would; some of them do.
4785. Mr. O'Connell.] But the class that occupy them are industrious persons?—Generally speaking, I think they are. I look upon them to be industrious people.
4786. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] I believe that system of having cellars is pretty nearly peculiar to Clonmel?—More so than any other town that I am acquainted with.
4787. Mr. Hamilton.] Describe the premises of William Haffernal.—It is in the main street; a cellar also, about nine feet wide.
4788. What depth?—I should think it is about from 24 to 28 feet.
4789. What do you conceive to be the value?—I think the value of it is about 5*l.* 10*s.* or 6*l.*; it is a small cellar, narrow.
4790. Chairman.] Well, now, whose property is that; who is the landlord?—There was a Miss Tinsley, that lived over head. The house over head was occupied by different people.
4791. To whom does Haffernal pay rent?—I do not know to whom he pays the rent.
4792. Mr. O'Connell.] These cellars are used as a kind of shops?—Yes.
4793. Their value consists in the opportunity of making money by selling various articles?—Yes, their principal value consists in that.
4794. And in addition to that, they are a kind of lodging-houses for the poorer classes?—They are, generally speaking.
4795. So that there are two trades in general carried on in each of them?—Two or three trades.
4796. Chairman.] Are they generally weekly or yearly tenants?—Generally yearly, I believe.

Mr. Gen. Graham.

17 April 1837.

4797. Mr. O'Connell.] Some of them are held by lease?—I do not know any held by lease; there may be, but not to my knowledge.
4798. Then your judgment is, that in general they are held from year to year?—Just so.
4799. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know the premises of Daniel Hourigan?—I do.
4800. Describe them.—It is a cellar, also situated in the main street, similarly circumstanced; the value I think about 6*l.*; I think that is the outside value. The situation is what I term good, notwithstanding it is in the main street.
4801. Chairmen.] What is the profession or occupation of the person?—A cooper.

Mercurii, 19^o die Aprilis, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.
Sir Robert Ferguson.
Mr. French.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Hogg.

Mr. Lefroy.
Mr. Morgan John O'Connell.
Lord Granville Somerset.
Mr. Emerson Tennent.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. George Graham, called in; and further Examined.

Mr. Gen. Graham.

19 April 1837.

4802. Mr. Hamilton.] ARE you acquainted with the premises of Thomas Hogan?—I am.
4803. He occupies a cellar, I believe?—He occupies a cellar under Mr. Mahoney, now the widow Mahoney, in the main street.
4804. Chairman.] No. 88?—88 is the number of the house.
4805. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know the value of that cellar?—I am not so well acquainted with that particular cellar, but from others in the neighbourhood of it I should think the utmost value would be perhaps about 8*l.*; I say not from a direct knowledge of the cellar itself.
4806. Do you happen to know what rent he pays?—I do not.
4807. Now, as to the premises of Michael Keffe?—That is a cellar also.
4808. What do you conceive to be its value?—Its value I take to be from 5*l.* to 6*l.*
4809. Are you taking now the outside value?—Yes; what I think would be the value.
4810. Are you taking the extreme value?—I take the extreme value in all cases in my estimation.
4811. Sir Robert Ferguson.] Have you been in that cellar for the purpose of valuation?—Not for the purpose of valuation; I have been in that cellar; but it is several years since; it is three or four years since I was down in the cellar.
4812. Chairman.] Are those premises, to your knowledge, in the same state now as they were when you were in them some years ago?—They appear to be about the same; it is a cellar, confined; it is at the corner of a street, and one that cannot be extended in any way; it is occupied by a tailor.
4813. Now, as to the holding of Anthony Mingan; is that also a cellar?—That is also a cellar; it is a cellar only about eight feet wide to the street.
4814. And how much in depth?—It may be about 20 feet or 22 to 24 feet, lighted by the entrance only.
4815. What do you conceive to be its value?—Perhaps from 5*l.* to 6*l.*; 6*l.* I will say is the extreme value; the situation is very good, or I would not value it at that; the width is only eight feet, or thereabouts.
4816. Do you happen to know the rent?—I do not.
4817. Is Anthony Mingan an elector?—He is.
4818. Chairman.] And Keffe?—And Keffe.
4819. And Hogan?—Yes.
4820. Mr. Hamilton.] Have you been in Mingan's premises for the purpose of valuing?—Not directly for the purpose of valuation; but I have been down it as being an inspector of weights and measures. I have gone down it, and did make observations upon it.
4821. Are you acquainted with the premises of John M'Auliffe?—I am.
4822. Describe the premises.—It is a cellar, about nine feet wide; it is about 20 feet

19 April 1837.

20 feet deep; no light, except by the entrance; and its utmost value I take to be about 6*l*.

4823. Do you know the rent?—I do not.

4824. Is N'Auliffe registered?—His name was on the list, and he voted at the election, at both contests.

4825. Have you been there for the purpose of valuation?—I have been there for the purpose of looking at it and inspecting it, that I might judge of its value; I went into it, having a double object in view.

4826. State the objects.—To examine measures, and to see the size of the cellar.

4827. When were you in the premises for that purpose?—I was in that cellar within the last fortnight; I had been in it frequently before.

4828. Do you know the premises occupied by Michael Morocy?—I do.

4829. Are they also a cellar?—Also a cellar, in the same street.

4830. Describe them.—It is a cellar about 18 feet wide by 20 deep; it is lighted; it has a small window in the rear of the house; no lights in front. The man is dead.

4831. What do you conceive to be the value of that cellar?—I put a value upon it, about 7*l*; but I understand from the owner of the cellar that it is set at 6*l*. 9*s*.

4832. Who is the owner?—The widow Shaw.

4833. Sir Robert Ferguson.] Do you mean, set to Morocy at that?—It was set rather, as she told me, to a woman named Ellen Wall, not Morocy at all; this I only give you as having it from Mrs. Shaw, who is the owner of the house.

4834. And did Morocy hold under Ellen Wall?—Yes; he must have held under her.

4835. Chairman.] Then he probably gave more for it?—I should think he did not, because she still lives in the house; the man was dead at that time, and there was a bill stuck on the cellar-door, "Lodgings, by Ellen Wall," at the time and before.

4836. Mr. Hamilton.] Then do you mean that Morocy was occupying the cellar at the same time as the widow Wall was occupying it?—Yes.

4837. And she was occupying it when he was registered?—Yes.

4838. Have you been in that cellar?—I was not down in the cellar; but I have been in the the parlour over it, and in the yard behind it.

4839. When?—That may be three years since; it was before Morocy's death.

4840. Now, as to the premises of Thomas O'Connor; does he occupy a cellar in like manner?—He occupies a cellar also.

4841. Do you know its dimensions?—It is rather a large cellar; it is about 18 feet wide by about 26 or 28 deep.

4842. Sir Robert Ferguson.] What street?—108, Main-street.

4843. Mr. Hamilton.] What value do you conceive it to be?—I should say that 7*l*. would be a high value for it.

4844. Is Thomas O'Connor registered?—Yes, he voted at the two contested elections.

4845. Have you been in his cellar for the purpose of valuation?—I was in it.

4846. When?—I was in it within the last fortnight, or three weeks at the most; I give you that not from actually measuring it, but from my idea of it.

4847. Are the premises of Cornelius O'Neil of the same description?—They are not; that is what we call a good cellar in that part of the town.

4848. Sir Robert Ferguson.] What part of the town?—It is 29, Dublin-street.

4849. What size is it?—It is about 22 feet by 26.

4850. Mr. Hamilton.] Of what value do you conceive it to be?—I dare say it is worth 8*l*.

4851. Sir Robert Ferguson.] How is it lighted?—It is lighted by the door and by a window from the street, and by another window from the rear.

4852. Mr. Hamilton.] Is Cornelius O'Neil registered?—He was, and voted at the first election, but he died subsequently.

4853. Do you know the premises of Thomas Shanghnessy?—I do.

4854. Describe them.—It is a cellar in Charleston-street; that cellar I measured, it is 17 by 26 feet.

4855. What do you conceive to be its value?—£. 7. 10*s*.; 8*l*. I would say; indeed 7*l*. 10*s*. would be the value of it.

4856. Does his name appear on the registry of voters?—It does.

4857. Chairman.] He is an occupier, is he not?—He is an occupier.

4858. When

Mr. Gen. Graham.

19 April 1837.

4858. When did you examine his premises?—I have not been in his premises I think for these two years, or three.

4859. Mr. *Hamilton*.]—Are you acquainted with the premises of John Smith?—I am.

4860. *Chairman*.] What is he, a carpenter?—There is John Smith and Matthew Smith, both occupying cellars.

4861. Which do you mean?—John Smith, 18, Johnson-street; his cellar is under Bartholomew Welch's, with a small apartment partitioned off it that extends under a part of the hall; the hall is in the centre of that house.

4862. He occupies the whole of the cellar, does he?—There are two cellars under one house, and he occupies one at one side of the hall-door, and another person occupies the other at the other side of the hall-door.

4863. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Who is the other person?—I do not know; I think it is a woman, as far as I recollect.

4864. *Chairman*.] Well, what is John Smith's worth?—I take it to be worth from 6 l. to 7 l.

4865. Sir *Robert Ferguson*.] Including the value of the apartments?—I include the value of the apartments.

4866. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Is he registered?—He did register out of it; he voted out of that cellar, or did live there at the time he voted.

4867. Have you been in his cellar?—I have.

4868. When?—It is two or three years since, I cannot exactly say.

4869. Sir *Robert Ferguson*.] Was it for the purpose of valuation?—It was for the purpose of making observations upon it, my object is going to it.

4870. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Now, as to Martin Smith, does he occupy a cellar?—He does.

4871. Describe it?—He did occupy a cellar that he voted out of and registered out of, that I can now describe, but not in which he lives at present.

4872. Describe the cellar out of which he voted?—The cellar out of which he voted was a cellar under Mr. Kelly's, in the Main street.

4873. *Chairman*.] That is 84?—84.

4874. What Mr. Kelly is that?—He is a respectable tallow-chandler and tobacconist.

4875. Not the clerk to the commissioners?—No; he is not. Mr. Kelly voted out of the same house, as, in most of those cases, people did, where they lived over cellars.

4876. In valuing a house in which a party lives, and who claims to vote, would the value of the cellar he also included in that house, or excluded?—It is generally included in the value of that house.

4877. Supposing Mr. Kelly is registered as a 10 l. voter, would that be the value of his house, exclusive of the cellar, or inclusive of the cellar?—It would be the value of his house, inasmuch as his house is above the value of 40 l. a year.

4878. But in valuing that house, would you add the value of the cellar to the value of the house, when you talked of the value of the whole house?—If I were an applotter, and put a value for parish rates upon that house, I would certainly include the cellar.

4879. Now you say that you would include; in saying that, do you mean to state that that is the way in which the applotment is laid at the present moment?—I cannot say whether it is so or not; but I think the cellars do not in any other way pay; excepting they pay in that way they do not pay at all.

4880. Sir *Robert Ferguson*.] Can you say that the cellars are not included separately in the applotment?—I can say they are not included separately in the applotments; I never knew an instance of it; I have been on the applotments.

4881. Mr. *Hamilton*.] What do you conceive the value of the cellar occupied by Martin Smith?—About 7 l. or 7 guineas.

4882. Is Martin Smith registered?—He was registered out of the cellar that we are now speaking of; and he is, I believe, again registered out of another cellar, 112, Main-street, I believe.

4883. Are you acquainted with the cellar out of which he is now registered?—I am.

4884. What do you conceive to be its value?—Really I think that cellar is worth 10 l.; it is the best cellar; it is an exception to all others in Clonmel; it covers a considerable extent under a large house, lighted from behind; lighted by

by a window from the street; and there are vaults too under the street that no other house has.

4885. *Chairman.*] Do you mean to state that, generally speaking, these cellars are below the level of the street?—I do.

4886. How are they lighted?—Generally by the door that you enter; that is the principal light in all.

4887. Then supposing the door to be shut, the cellar is dark; is it?—It is in utter darkness if the door is closed.

4888. But there are instances, some of which you have mentioned in your evidence, of the top of the cellar being somewhat above the level of the street; and then I presume they are lighted by glass, are they not; by windows?—They are, in some cases, but not in all.

4889. *Sir Robert Ferguson.*] Have you the size of that cellar out of which Martin Smith first registered?—It is about 12 by 24 feet.

4890. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Describe the premises of Owen Sullivan.—

4890*. *Chairman.*]—Where does he live?—32, Bagwell-street.

4891. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Now describe his premises.—I do not know the size of that cellar particularly; but I should say it has no light from the front, except through the door.

4892. Has it any light from behind?—I am not particularly acquainted with that cellar; I cannot say.

4893. Are these cellars generally the property of the persons who occupy the house above them?—Generally they are.

4894. And are they let by them to the persons who register out of them?—Generally so.

4895. And you state that the top of the cellars generally are on a level with the ground of the street?—I do.

4896. Are you aware of any instance of persons, more than one of whom are registered out of the same house, independent and exclusive of the cellar?—I am; in the very last cellar we were speaking of, Owen Sullivan's, there were three registered out of that house, including the cellar.

4897. State the names of the other two individuals who were registered out of the house, the cellar of which was occupied by Owen Sullivan.—There was John Prendergast and Joseph Burke.

4898. Do they occupy the house jointly or separately?—Neither of them inhabit it at present; Burke was merely a lodger in it; he superintended some works at the barracks at the time.

4899. *Chairman.*] John Prendergast was a publican?—Yes.

4900. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Well, now what did Prendergast occupy in the house?—I did not know the house further than the ground-floor.

4901. But he occupied the ground-floor?—He did.

4902. Were there two entrances to the house?—There were, but they communicated inside; there was a hall-door and a shop-door; they communicated inside; there was but one common staircase, but the cellar was distinct.

4903. *Chairman.*] What is Burke's name?—Joseph.

4904. *Sir Robert Ferguson.*] What trade was Burke?—He was no trade that I know of; he had a contract, or acted for some person who had a contract for forage at the barracks.

4905. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Do you mean to say Joseph Burke was a weekly lodger?—I do not mean to say he was a weekly lodger, for I know that he has been in the house six months or more.

4906. You stated he was a lodger?—I took him to be a lodger, because there was only one story in the house, and I always heard so; indeed, he occupied, I believe, two rooms on the second floor.

4907. What do you conceive to be the value of the whole house, independent of the cellar?—The whole house I take to be worth from 35*l.* to 40*l.*

4908. *Sir Robert Ferguson.*] Is that inclusive of the cellar?—It is inclusive of the cellar; we always include the cellar in valuing houses.

4909. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Do you know whether the names of John Prendergast, Joseph Burke and Owen Sullivan appeared in the registry?—They did.

4910. *Sir Robert Ferguson.*] Do you know whether they were all entered on the registry at the same date; at the same sessions?—I think they were; for I know they all voted at the first contested election in Clonmel.

Mr. Gen. Graham.

19 April 1837.

4911. Mr. Hamilton.] Can you state whether John and Thomas Graham were registered out of the same house?—Out of the same house, they were.
4912. Did they occupy separate parts of the house?—They did not.
4913. They occupied jointly?—They occupied the house in common, they and their mother; they were nephews of mine; cabinet-makers of the firm of Choice, Graham & Sons; two sons registered out of the one house; it was common to all.
4914. Then you mean to say, you know they had no separate interest in the different parts of the house?—No separate interest; the interest was in common.
4915. Have you seen their names on the registry?—I have.
4916. What do you conceive to be the value of the whole house?—The whole house, including the premises and workshops attached, I think they pay between 50*l.* and 60*l.* for.
4917. Sir Robert Ferguson.] Who did Shaugnessy vote for?—For Mr. Ronayne.
4918. Prendergast?—For Mr. Ronayne.
4919. And Burke?—For Mr. Ronayne.
4920. For whom did the Grahams vote?—For Mr. Bagwell.
4921. Mr. Hamilton.] Can you state the circumstances of Walter and William Keating in respect of their holding?—Yes, they are ironmongers; both their names appeared on the registry, and both of them voted; the father was living at the time, and, I believe, was the sole owner of the concern; the accounts and all was done in the father's name exclusively.
4922. Can you state whether or not he had let the premises, or any part of them, to his sons?—I should think not.
4923. Do you know?—I do not of myself know, but I rather think not. I know that in purchasing anything the accounts were made out exclusively in the father's name.
4924. Mr. Hamilton.] Can you state how they occupied the house?—Not from my own personal knowledge, but I believe in common. I know some five or six years since they did; since that I am not acquainted with it.
4925. Can you state when they were registered?—They were registered the first registry under the Reform Act.
4926. That was in 1832?—I think so.
4927. You cannot state how they occupied at that time?—It is at that time I am speaking of.
4928. Then do you know they occupied the house in common at that time?—I rather think they did; I know a short time before that registry they did.
4929. Sir Robert Ferguson.] What is the value of that house?—That house and premises are worth 50*l.* or 60*l.* a year; at least that.
4930. Can you state how the Rev. Sackville Burke and James Burke occupy the premises which they hold?—Yes; James Burke is a respectable woollen-draper; the Rev. Sackville Burke lodged with him, but occupied a suite of apartments of his own; two or three rooms.
4931. Sir Robert Ferguson.] Had he a separate entrance?—No, the entrance was in common; but, as well as my recollection bears me out, he registered out of a stable at the rear of Burke's house; not out of his lodging, but out of a stable.
4932. Mr. Hamilton.] Are the premises valuable?—Burke's dwelling-house is valuable, but I do not think the stable is.
4933. What do you conceive to be the value of the stable?—I really should not think it worth more than 8*l.* or 9*l.*
4934. Have you seen their names on the registry?—I did; one of them voted, and the other did not.
4935. Sir Robert Ferguson.] What do you conceive the house worth?—I think that house and premises are worth above 50*l.*
4936. Mr. Hamilton.] Can you describe the circumstances under which John and Edward Durney occupied their holding?—Their holding was in common.
4937. They were holders in common?—Yes; they were tailors.
4938. Have you seen their names on the registry?—I did.
4939. Sir Robert Ferguson.] What do you conceive to be the value of the premises out of which the Durneys registered?—I think the whole value of their premises would not be more than about 12*l.*; 12*l.* or 14*l.*; they would not be worth more.
4940. Mr. Hamilton.] Are you acquainted with the house occupied by John Hackett and Dominick Ronayne?—I know the house, and have been frequently

- in it; not up stairs often, but frequently through the house; I lighted it with gas for them some time ago.
4941. Do they both occupy that house?—They do, both; Mr. Ronayne, I believe, has an office in it; I was in his office.
4942. Have they a joint or a separate occupation?—I know they have one common entrance to both; it has one hall-door and shop-door.
4943. Whose is the house?—Mr. Hacket's.
4944. Are you aware what rent Mr. Ronayne pays?—I am not; but I know it is a very valuable house.
4945. Do their names appear on the registry?—They do.
4946. Sir Robert Ferguson.] What is the value of the house?—I take that house to be worth 70*l.* or 80*l.*, including his printing-office; at least that.
4947. Mr. Hamilton.] Can you state the circumstances of Thomas Atkins's premises, in Duckett-street?—Yes.
4948. Was he registered out of a house in Duckett-street?—He was.
4949. Can you state whether he was at any time dispossessed?—I myself dispossessed him; at one time I acted for his landlord or landlady; I dispossessed him for nonpayment of rent.
4950. Was he actually evicted?—He was.
4951. Was the house subsequently let to any other person?—It was.
4952. Can you state whether that person registered and voted?—He did.
4953. What was his name?—Thomas Ryan.
4954. Did Atkins, at any subsequent period, occupy any part of that house?—I understand from Ryan that he let him two rooms out of the house, out of which he has since voted; I have known him to vote since decidedly out of that house.
4955. Can you state whether he registered since he took that part of the house?—I rather think not; he had only two little apartments.
4956. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You do not know whether he did or not?—No; I say I rather think not.
4957. Mr. Hamilton.] Refer to the registry, and let me know when he first registered; Thomas Atkins?—He was registered at the first registry at Clonmel. [The Witness referred to the Registry.] If this is correct, he registered on the 30th October 1832.
4958. See if he has been registered since; if he has been re-registered; can you state from the examination of that list, whether Thomas Atkins has been re-registered since?—He has not, if this register is correct. To my knowledge, he has not registered since; nor I verily believe he has not, because I do not think he would attempt to register.
4959. And he voted after his being evicted?—He did.
4960. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Why should he not attempt to register?—He had been registered out of the house out of which I dispossessed him for nonpayment of rent.
4961. What was the name of the person to whom you relet it?—Thomas Ryan.
4962. And does he appear upon the register?—
4963. Chairman.] Look, and see if Thomas Ryan's name is not upon that?—Yes; he registered in January 1835.
4964. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] He registered in January 1835?—Yes.
4965. Did you say he voted at the last election?—No, not that he voted; but that Atkins voted.
4966. Then Ryan did not vote?—I do not think he did; to the best of my knowledge he did not.
4967. Mr. Hamilton.] Are you acquainted with the premises occupied by Michael Connors, in George's-court?—I am; it is a small house in George's-court.
4968. What do you conceive to be the value of those premises?—I think from 6*l.* to 7*l.*
4969. Do you happen to know the rent that Connors pays?—I do not; 6*l.* I consider to be the value of that house; about 6*l.*
4970. Does his name appear upon the registry?—Yes, it does.
4971. Do you know the premises occupied by Daniel English, in Johnson-street?—I do.
4972. What

Mr. Geo. Graham.

19 April 1837.

4972. What do you conceive to be the value of those premises?—The part he occupies himself I take to be worth about 4 l. or 5 l. However, there is another house adjoining, that I believe is his also; they are both attached.
4973. What is the value of the other house?—Perhaps about the same.
4974. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] That is 9 l. or 10 l. between them?—Yes, the two houses would be worth about 8 l.
4975. Which is it you say, 4 l. or 5 l.? Is it 5 l. or 4 l.?—I take the other house not to be of the same value, for it has not so good a rear.
4976. You said 4 l. or 5 l.; which will you abide by?—I will abide by 5 l. for each house, as being the extreme value for them.
4977. Mr. Hamilton.] Can you state whether the tenant of the adjoining house is registered or not?—I think not.
4978. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] When you say attached, what do you mean?—I meant that they were joining each other, but they were separate and distinct houses.
4979. Will you undertake to say there is no communication internally between them?—Not, excepting the yard, there is not.
4980. That is external; but I mean nothing internal?—There can be nothing internal.
4981. Have you been over the houses?—Not both; I was through that of English.
4982. When you say through it, do you mean upstairs?—There are no stairs; it is a little attached cabin, and only about seven feet wide, not half so big as a gateway for a carriage to drive through.
4983. And yet the two are worth 10 l. a year?—I say that is the extreme value.
4984. Do you mean to say, you think you have gone beyond the value?—Indeed I do think I am rather beyond the value, and I think I am beyond the value in all the cases I have spoken to; that I have given an extreme value to all; a full value to all; I think so, at least.
4985. Mr. Hamilton.] Now, can you state the value of the premises of William Gorman, in Bagwell-street?—I can; I can state the sort of premises they are. It was a small house shedded up against the end of another, about eight or nine feet wide; at the time that I took notice of it more than half the roof was not on, it was broken down.
4986. Was it thatched or slated?—Slated.
4987. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] What was the time you took notice of it?—I think about three years ago, or four years; three or four years ago.
4988. And when was he registered?—He was registered at the first registry after the passing of the Reform Act.
4989. In 1832?—In 1832.
4990. That is five years ago?—It was since that, it was the spring following.
4991. And you made a valuation of it after the roof had fallen in, which was a year or two after the man was registered?—Yes, but the roof had fallen in at the time he registered.
4992. How do you know that?—Because I recollect it.
4993. Did you make the valuation before the period you first mentioned?—I did not; but I made the valuation equal to what it had been to my knowledge for the last 15 years, till it was taken down entirely.
4994. Did the man live in it with the roof off?—He did.
4995. What was the fancy for that?—I suppose he was not able to get into a better one; it is a thing not very uncommon.
4996. What, to live in a house without a roof?—Yes, in Clonmel. I know two houses now that have been burned five or six years past, the roof burned off, and yet there have been people living in them.
4997. Have they no covering on them?—None from that day to this; there is not a roof put on, and yet people live in them.
4998. Were they not covered over in some way?—Only by the parlour floor; all the rain must pass through on to them if it were not for that.
4999. Do they live above that floor or under it?—Under it; they cannot live above it.
5000. Then that floor acts as a roof?—It does.
5001. Mr. Hamilton.] Is William Gorman registered?—He did register the first registry in Clonmel; but that house is gone away entirely since.
5002. Mr.

5002. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Roof and all?—Yes, and foundation and all.
5003. Where is it gone to?—Perhaps part of it is thrown into the foundation of the present Branch Bank of Ireland.
5004. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know the premises occupied by William Maher, in Bagwell-street?—I do; I knew them when they were in existence.
5005. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Are they gone too?—They are gone too; it was up against the end of Mara's-place and Dunn's that this shed was built of Gorman's.
5006. Mr. Hamilton.] Can you state the value of these premises when they existed?—I hardly know how to put a value upon those, because in Mara's-place there was a passage to a staircase through his, that necessarily would leave his place at all times open to the family who lived over head.
5007. Do you happen to know either what Mara or Gorman got for their interest in those premises when they were taken down?—I never heard they got anything, for the place belonged to a man of the name of Dunn.
5008. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You never heard they got anything?—No; that either Mara or Gorman got anything.
5009. Do you mean to say they got nothing?—I do not.
5010. Now go to William Gorman, and apply your mind to that; was he a smith?—He was.
5011. What did you state was the value of his premises?—I stated from 6 l. to 7 l.
5012. Do you happen to know he had a forge there?—I do, in front of the street.
5013. That was part of the premises?—It was part of the premises.
5014. And he registered out of the house before?—He did; it is all one.
5015. Now I believe that is one of the best situations in Clonmel, is it not?—It is a tolerable good situation.
5016. Is it not one of the best?—That part was not, for it was peculiarly circumstanced; it was a way off the street; there is a fall-in from the line of the street.
5017. But you say it was a tolerable good situation?—Yes, I do.
5018. Now your valuation is from 6 l. to 7 l. for those premises at the time of registry?—It is; I speak as to my own judgment.
5019. Was there not a back yard?—No back yard to that that I know of at all.
5020. But you do not say that there was no back yard?—Indeed, I may almost say there was not.
5021. But can you positively say?—I would not positively say; but if there was, it must have been very small indeed.
5022. I believe he was called a coach-smith?—He was.
5023. And the premises which are required for that branch of the business must be rather extensive?—His line is not very extensive.
5024. I said rather extensive; were they not rather extensive?—Not at all.
5025. Not more than an ordinary smith's?—No; for what he did was only merely jobbing, and such things; he never wanted more than a carriage to come into his place at one time.
5026. But for that there must be a greater extent of premises than are required for an ordinary smith?—The whole extent was very inconsiderable.
5027. But for the limited trade, you say he was engaged in, would he not require more extensive premises than if he were an ordinary smith or a nailer?—Yes.
5028. Now, I will put this question; would you be surprised to hear that that man paid 12 l. a year British, that is 13 l. Irish?—I would, decidedly.
5029. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then I will see if I cannot surprise you.—Well, it will surprise me, I assure you.
5030. With respect to English; do you happen to know that English had a lease of these premises?—I do not; but I have heard it stated by other people that English's place was not worth more than 3 l., though I set a higher value upon it.
5031. But you think the utmost value of the two houses was 8 l. each?—I do.
5032. Allow me to ask you what the other people were who said that English's premises were not worth 3 l.; were they voters for Mr. Ronayne?—I have heard voters for Mr. Ronayne say so.
5033. Have you heard voters for Mr. Bagwell say so?—I have.

Mr. Geo. Graham.
19 April 1837.

5034. Can you name any of the voters for Mr. Ronayne who said so?—No, I cannot just now.
5035. Do you remember any of Mr. Bagwell's voters who said so?—I think I have heard Mr. Higgins and Mr. Smith, who you have had before you, say so.
5036. Did you hear any other person say so?—I did not hear them say so these two years to my knowledge.
5037. But how often did they say so before?—I am not sure whether they said so a second time, or even whether the two said so once.
5038. You are not sure even as to Mr. Higgins and Mr. Smith that they ever said so?—Indeed I am rather certain; I will not take on me positively to say, but, to the best of my knowledge and belief, I have heard them both say so.
5039. Did they say it more than once?—I think, in conversation with them from time to time, I may have heard it more than once from them.
5040. But, in point of fact, did you?—I will not take on myself to say I did.
5041. Well now, did you hear Mr. Ronayne's voters more than once say these premises were not worth more than 3*l.*?—Indeed I have.
5042. How often?—I cannot tell you that; I never kept account of things of that kind.
5043. How many voters said so?—One, at least, to my knowledge.
5044. Well, will you venture to go beyond one?—I will not.
5045. If it was only one, cannot you give me his name?—I can.
5046. Well, who is he?—William Burke.
5047. Who is William Burke?—No, Michael Dignum it was.
5048. You heard Dignum say so?—Yes.
5049. Is Michael Dignum here?—He is not.
5050. You heard Michael Dignum say that Daniel English's premises were not worth more than 3*l.*?—I did.
5051. Could you state how long ago it is since you heard him say that?—It may be two years; this Dignum himself was about registering at the time, and I told him to be careful that his place was of full value, and he said, surely it was worth more than English's, that was not worth 3*l.*; that he paid, I think, 8*l.* or 10*l.* for his.
5052. *Chairman.*] Where does Michael Dignum live now?—I really do not know; I believe in Johnson-street, Clonmel.
5053. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Do you think he is in town at all?—I am not positive.
5054. If he registered in January 1836, that cannot be two years ago?—I cannot speak positively as to the time.
5055. Well, you cautioned him to take care how he registered?—Yes.
5056. Why did you take on yourself to caution him?—Because he spoke to me on the subject whether he should or not; he is a working man in my employ; at the time he advised with me whether he had better register or not, I told him he might act as he pleased; and he said he thought his place was worth more than English's; I said, be careful as to value, how you commit yourself; his reply was, surely it is worth more than English's; that he paid 12*l.* for it.
5057. This conversation occurred between you and Dignum, your workman?—My workman; while in my employ.
5058. And you were one of Mr. Bagwell's friends, were you not?—I did vote for him.
5059. You were in his interest?—Yes.
5060. Strongly so?—Not particularly so; I do not know what you call strongly; I voted for him.
5061. Did you vote for Mr. Ronayne?—No; he never asked me.
5062. Would you have voted for him if he had asked you?—It is very possible if he had asked me at that time, I would not have voted for either.
5063. Are you sure that you would not have voted for Mr. Ronayne?—I am quite sure I would not have voted for Mr. Ronayne while Mr. Bagwell would be in the field.
5064. Did you say you were not quite sure whether you would vote for either?—Neither, at that contest.
5065. What objection had you to Mr. Bagwell?—No objection at all to Mr. Bagwell; I did not like to come forward publicly at all at that time, from the situation I held.
5066. Had you been in a public situation then?—No, but I had a great deal

to do with the public; I was the proprietor of a gas establishment, and I did not want to get into politics, lest it might injure my interest.

5067. You were then the proprietor of a gas establishment?—Yes.

5068. Are you now?—I am.

5069. Do you contract for lighting the town?—I do.

5070. How long have you been a contractor?—About 10 years, I should think.

5071. Were you a contractor under the first commissioners?—I was.

5072. And are a contractor under the present?—I am.

5073. The first commissioners went out; do you remember at what time?—Indeed I do not. I know they stop in for three years, or thereabouts; the period allowed by the Act of the 9 Geo. 4, I think it was.

5074. Then you have had experience of both sets of commissioners?—I have.

5075. Have you any complaint to make against the present?—None in the world to make against them; not a bit.

5076. Do you consider they are doing their business as well as they ought to do?—As far as I am concerned I have no complaint in the world to make against them.

5077. But have you any complaint against them now?—None whatever.

5078. On any ground?—Not on any ground.

5079. And you consider they are doing their business as well as the first set of commissioners did?—So far as regards me, or that I know of.

5080. There are some very respectable men among them, I believe?—There are some respectable men amongst them.

5081. Mr. Hamilton.] Was Dignum registered?—He was; his name appeared on the registry.

5082. Did you find any fault with him afterwards for having registered?—None in the world.

5083. So that in point of fact, though he was in your employment, he was perfectly free to act as he pleased?—Perfectly. I never interfered yet with a man about his registering.

5084. Are you acquainted with premises of Michael Murphy, of Johnson-street?—I am.

5085. State the value of his premises.—I have set a value upon them at 6 l.; 5 l. 10 s., or 6 l. However, his landlord tells me that he rented it to him yearly at five guineas, and that he was not able to get it from him, and that he dispossessed him, and put another into possession.

5086. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] When did he dispossess him?—I do not know; but the landlord told me so within the last three weeks.

5087. Mr. Hamilton.] Who is the landlord?—George Glasscot.

5088. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Is that in Upper Johnson-street?—It is.

5089. Mr. Hamilton.] Does Michael Murphy's name appear on the registry?—It does.

5090. Do you know the premises occupied by Jeremiah Myers?—I do.

5091. They are in Johnson-street also?—Yes, adjoining the other.

5092. State the value of those premises.—The value of those is about 7 l. 10 s.

5093. Do you know the rent?—I know that since I fixed that value upon it the landlord told me he charged 7 l. for it.

5094. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Who is the landlord?—George Glasscot.

5095. Mr. Hamilton.] Is Myers's name on the registry?—It is.

5096. Did he vote?—He did.

5097. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you happen to know that he has built upon the premises?—Not without it is recently; within the last two or three years.

5098. Are there no additional buildings, except within the last two or three years?—No additional buildings built by him.

5099. Myers is a victualler, is he not?—Yes.

5100. Have you been in those premises?—I have.

5101. They consist of several apartments, I believe?—No.

5102. How many?—I cannot properly say; more than two; there is a kind of a loft above.

5103. You are quite sure of that?—This may be divided in a sort of way, with little partitions, that I could not really call different rooms or apartments.

5104. Will you undertake to say there are but two apartments?—I will not.

Mr. Geo. Graham.

19 April 1837.

5105. How many will you say there are?—It is very hard really to designate what they call apartments in their way, for they will call them rooms if they have only a mat hanging down.

5106. Do you mean to say there is a mat hanging down there?—No.

5107. Confine your attention to this; you say you have been in the premises; do you know them well?—Not intimately; I have not been in them these three years.

5108. Is this the result of your evidence, that you cannot say how many apartments there are?—I can say, in any way they cannot possibly exceed four.

5109. Do you happen to know there is a plot of ground in the rear?—I do.

5110. Do you know what use is made of that?—It was a small garden when I saw it.

5111. I am speaking of the place where the sheep are put in?—I know he had no place to feed sheep behind that house, except he has got another tale since he registered.

5112. Then, can you state positively that at the time of his registry he had no plot of ground behind, where he used to feed sheep?—None; there is a small garden, he might feed them by giving them hay or vegetables.

5113. But as a sheep-walk?—He has not, for his landlord has none himself; if he did he must have it from another landlord; another piece of ground.

5114. Will you state positively at the time of the registry there was no plot of ground behind those premises where Myers was in the habit of feeding sheep?—There was no plot that would feed one sheep in it.

5115. Will you state, there is no plot that would feed 20 sheep?—I would, decidedly.

5116. Or 10?—Or 10.

5117. Is there a slaughter-house annexed?—There was a small slaughter-house, a little shadded thing up against one of the walls.

5118. And that was built by the tenant Myers?—I do not say whether it was or not.

5119. Now, Bowles; did you give any evidence about Walter Bowles' holding?—I did not.

5120. Do you know anything about it?—I do not; not particularly, that I can give any description whatever of it.

5121. Who was his landlord?—Glaescot.

5122. Who did Glaescot vote for?—For Mr. Bagwell.

5123. And he thought the premises were not worth more than 7 l.; he thought it was a high rent; is not that so?—So he told me.

5124. Mr. Hamilton.] State what you know of the premises of Michael Tobin of Berwick-street?—That was a small house in Berwick-street, nearly opposite the barracks; a small house with a plot of ground behind it. The house in front was about from nine to ten feet wide; it is not in existence now.

5125. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] The house is gone?—The house is gone.

5126. Mr. Hamilton.] How is it that the house is gone?—It was what we call the Jutland property, and all that class of houses were removed by the landlord.

5127. Did the landlord make any compensation to the tenants?—I believe the great majority of them paid no rent for years to him.

5128. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Was Michael Tobin one of those who paid no rent?—He did not derive directly from the head landlord, but from Mr. Rylance; I believe he paid the rent to Rylance regularly.

5129. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know what the rent was?—£. 7.

5130. What do you conceive to be the value of the house?—I conceive the value of the house at that time to have been 7 l., or 7 l. 10 s.; his landlord told me he only paid 6 l. 10 s. for it.

5131. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Who was his landlord?—Thaneas Rylance.

5132. Who does he vote for?—I am not positive; he did vote for Mr. Bagwell.

5133. And he thought 7 l. too much?—No; he told me that he set it to his, and he never thought of asking more than 6 l. 10 s.

5134. Therefore he considered 7 l. too much?—He did, I suppose, so far; landlords with us generally look to the highest rent they can get.

5135. Mr. Hamilton.] Was Michael Tobin registered?—He was.

5136. Do you know the premises occupied by Paul Winburg, in Catherine-street?—I do.

5137. Describe

5137. Describe them.—It is a very small house, and in very bad condition indeed; it has now been improved, for the roof has been recently repaired, with a small yard to it.

5138. Can you state the dimensions?—It is 15 feet front and 20 feet deep.

5139. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did you measure it?—I did, and received rent for it for some years for another person.

5140. For whom?—For Miss Flanagan.

5141. Was the rent paid by Winburg?—Not for the last four or five years.

5142. What rent was Winburg liable to?—He had been leased to it at 10 guineas a year; but the place was not worth it; his landlady cancelled the lease, he being in arrears something over 20 l.; she forgave him these arrears, if he only gave up the premises; she cancelled the lease, and gave the premises to him by the year at 8 l. or guineas.

5143. Chairman.] And this you know, as the agent for the proprietor?—Yes, at the time.

5144. When did that take place?—About 12 months ago, I think.

5145. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then up to that period he paid 10 guineas a year rent?—It was leased to him, but he did not pay it.

5146. But, however, the rent that he was liable to pay was 10 guineas?—It was.

5147. When was that lease made?—That lease was made about 20 years ago.

5148. Then of course at the time when he registered his rent was 10 guineas a year?—He was leased at 10 guineas a year.

5149. Mr. Hamilton.] He was registered, I believe?—He was.

5150. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] He is a hatcher, is he not?—He is.

5151. And there is a slaughter-house annexed to the premises?—There is such an one as that of Myers; it is now, indeed, pretty fair, for since the rent was reduced, he has repaired the roof of it, and he has made it now, for him, a very fair slaughter-house.

5152. Mr. Hamilton.] Has he been registered since the reduction of his rent?—No, he has not.

5153. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Was no further lease made to him?—No lease made to him.

5154. Was there any contract in writing entered into?—No contract in writing.

5155. What do you call cancelling the lease; how was that done?—Destroyed.

5156. How do you mean destroyed; burnt?—Torn, destroyed.

5157. What part of it was torn?—The whole body of the thing torn across.

5158. John M'Auliffe was one of the persons you were examined to?—Yes, in the Main-street.

5159. He had a cellar?—A cellar.

5160. And your evidence as to him was, that it was not worth more than 6 l., I think?—I think I said 6 l. or 7 l.; about 7 l.

5161. Which do you abide by, 6 l. or 7 l.?—I would say, divide it, if I were to go to the thing minutely. I should say 6 l. 10 s., if I were to be very particular.

5162. Then I wish you to be very particular; 6 l. 10 s.?—£. 6 10 s. It is not an easy matter to value those things.

5163. But I wish you to form the best judgment you can at the moment; your impression is it is 6 l. 10 s.?—That is my impression.

5164. Who called on you to give evidence here before this Committee?—I received a letter from one of the gentlemen of the Committee, that I would be summoned; that a summons was coming for me; and begged of me to come over, or the business would be over previous to the summons arriving, as it could not be issued, I think, on the day that the letter was sent.

5165. Was that the first communication you had on the subject?—It was.

5166. You did not know before that you were to be called upon to give evidence?—I did not. I heard a great many say, they were surprised I was not summoned, and that I was not coming.

5167. Do you know why they were surprised?—I do not, except that they thought I might have known a good deal of the value of places; I do not know for what reason they thought so.

Mr. Geo. Graham.

19 April 1837.

5168. Are you very confident of your own judgment in matters of the value of premises?—Not so confident as that I would not submit to the judgment of others if I thought they had a better knowledge of the particular thing.

5169. And more especially if there were two or three who differed from you as to a pound or two?—If they were people I thought competent at all to give an opinion upon its value, I would certainly submit my opinion.

5170. Now, accordingly, in cases where, in your judgment, premises are not worth more than 8*l.*, or thereabouts, if two or three gentlemen of competent judgment and fairness were to pronounce them worth 10*l.*, you would be inclined to mistrust your own, I dare say, at least in some cases?—I would be in some cases; if I had a perfect knowledge of the place, and conceiving they had not, I would not submit.

5171. You were asked as to the premises of Cornelius O'Neil?—I was.

5172. Did you give any evidence about the premises of Owen Sullivan?—Not directly about his premises, as well as I recollect.

5173. I believe you did not know much about the value?—Not about the value of those.

5174. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now, John and Edward Durney; was it as to the value that you were examined with respect to them?—That was joint occupancy.

5175. And you stated that they occupied in common?—Yes.

5176. And that they both registered out of it?—Yes.

5177. Now, with respect to the Rev. Sackville Burke and Mr. James Burke, that was also a case of joint occupancy?—Yes.

5178. But I find you stated that the Rev. Sackville Burke registered out of a stable in the rear?—So the impression, I say, is in my mind.

5179. Now, the stable that it is your impression the Rev. Mr. Burke registered out of was, you stated, worth 8*l.* or 9*l.*?—I think so; but I speak as to the outside value in that and all other cases.

5180. Could you not strain your judgment so far as to say it was worth 10*l.*?—I could not, indeed; if I were asked my opinion upon it I could not.

5181. Now, supposing in that case, one or more gentlemen of competent judgment and fairness were to be of opinion it was worth 10*l.*, who knew the premises well, would you be inclined to think you had not gone far enough?—As I stated before, if I thought they knew the place and the value of that local spot, I would be inclined to submit; but they should show me very strong reasons in that case.

5182. What did you state was the value of the whole house?—The value of the whole house and premises, including the stable, I should say was about 50*l.*

5183. Now the same thing, I think, applies to Walter and William Keating; that was also a case of joint occupancy, you conceive?—It was.

5184. That is your impression?—That is my impression; I have not given it as being positively so.

5185. And in like manner John and Thomas Graham?—They I speak positively to, because they are nephews of my own.

5186. Then they voted for Mr. Bagwell?—They did.

5187. How did Messrs. Keating vote?—I believe for Mr. Romayne; I am not positive whether the second did; one did, and I believe both; but I am not positive.

5188. Now, how did these Messrs. Burke vote?—One of them for Mr. Bagwell, and the other did not vote at all, as well as my recollection bears me out; and it was in like manner with Messrs. Goings.

5189. Have you given any evidence about them?—I do not know whether I did or not; the thing just struck me as being the same.

5190. One voted for Mr. Bagwell, and the other did not vote at all?—Just so, according to my recollection.

5191. Did they also register out of one house?—They did.

5192. What do you call that house; where is it?—In the Irish Town.

5193. What are they?—They are tallow-chandlers and tobacconists.

5194. Do you recollect any other instance besides those you have enumerated, in which persons who voted for Mr. Bagwell registered out of the same premises?—At this moment it does not strike me.

5195. You have given evidence, I see, about Owen Shaughnessy and John Prendergust?—I do not know Owen Shaughnessy; it is Thomas Shaughnessy.

5196. Where

5196. Where does he live?—He lives in Johnson-street.
5197. He registered out of a cellar?—He did.
5198. And John Prendergast registered out of a ground-floor; he is a publican?—No; Shaughnessy lives in Charles Atcheson's cellar.
5199. That has nothing to do with Prendergast's holding?—No; not in the same street at all.
5200. Then you gave no evidence about Owen Shaughnessy?—I do not know such a person; I know Owen Sullivan.
5201. Did he register out of a cellar?—His name appeared on the register.
5202. What is your objection to that?—I did not state anything respecting his, for I am not perfectly acquainted with it.
5203. You only stated the fact that he registered out of a cellar, and somebody else out of the premises above?—Just so.
5204. That cellar, like all others, having an external communication with the street?—Yes.
5205. What is your objection then to that registry?—I have no objection to any of the registries.
5206. What is the name of your clerk who Mr. Legge stated as being the master of an Orange lodge?—His name is George Haddenham.
5207. He was the head of one of the Orange lodges?—It is so said.
5208. Mr. Legge mentioned it; Mr. Legge was a member of the body?—
5209. *Chairman.*] Did you know that Mr. Legge mentioned the fact?—I did not.
5210. You yourself are not a member of that body?—I am not.
5211. You were?—I was.
5212. Up to the time of the dissolution?—At the time they were recommended to dissolve by the Crown and the Parliament.
5213. Were you in any official station in the body?—Never in my life. I was, in fact, a member of it for 30 years, I believe.
5214. Were you a member of any other political body or society?—No; nor did not in all that time meet five times with them, perhaps.
5215. Haddenham, your clerk, I believe was grand master, was he not?—I rather think not; he is master, I believe, in Clonmel.
5216. Perhaps, I am wrong; he was grand master of the district, perhaps?—I rather think not.
5217. Then he was only master of the lodge?—I believe that was all.
5218. Speaking of John M'Auliffe's cellar, I think you stated it was worth about 6*l.*?—Yes.
5219. Do you happen to know that there is more than one apartment in that cellar?—I do.
5220. Now, is it not fitted up as a complete shop?—It is.
5221. A calico shop?—Yes, just so.
5222. With counters and shelves, and a considerable quantity of goods?—No considerable quantity of goods.
5223. M'Auliffe is a comfortable man, I believe?—He is, I believe so.
5224. Do you know how long he has been living there; is it as long as six years?—At least that.
5225. Do you know what rent he pays?—No.
5226. What should you suppose?—I do not know; I should suppose about 6*l.*
5227. Would you be surprised to hear he paid 8*l.* 8*s.* rent?—Indeed I would.
5228. There are two apartments in it?—Yes.
5229. Do you know who occupied it before?—No.
5230. Did you ever hear that a person of the name of Sullivan occupied it?—I did not.
5231. You may not know the fact, but should you not be very much surprised to hear that Sullivan made above 2,000*l.* in that cellar, and he gave his daughter 700*l.* as a marriage portion?—I know a great many people who have amassed money in those cellars; a great many.
5232. With respect to Martin Smith, I think your evidence is that he is now registered out of a cellar in Main-street?—Yes.
5233. Which is full value?—I think it is full value.
5234. Then there is no objection to his registry at present?—I do not object to any.
5235. But your evidence does not go to impugn his registry?—No.

Mr. Geo. Graham.

19 April 1837.

5236. You stated you did not consider the cellar to be of full value?—Not the cellar he is now in.

5237. Do I understand you to have said you would include the cellar as part of the house, and you would not value them separately?—I would not value them separately; it is not usually done, I believe, in Cloumel.

5238. But it has been done?—I do not know an instance of it in the way of setting valuation for local taxes, or any other taxes; I do not know an instance of it.

5239. You have not been a valuator?—I have not been a valuator.

5240. Now, with respect to Thomas Shaughnessy's cellar; you know him?—Yes.

5241. He is the occupier?—Yes.

5242. You valued that, I think, at 7*l*. 10*s.*, or 8*l*?—I did at 8*l*, I believe.

5243. And you could not go beyond that?—I do not think it would be worth more in that part of Cloumel, nor in any part of Cloumel; I would not call it worth more.

5244. Then you would be surprised to hear he actually pays 9*l*. a year rent?—No, that would not surprise me a great deal; because I know the man whom he has it from, and he will exact the utmost furthing from him.

5245. But do you think Thomas Shaughnessy would give more than the value?—No; but this I believe, that not only that class of people, but any other who get into a fixed place, does not like to part with it, on account of his trade.

5246. That is to say, they would give more rent than the premises are worth?—Yes.

5247. And you state that to be the practice?—Not the practice; but there are instances in which such things would be done; I do not say it is the practice.

5248. That is to say, the tenant finds it worth his while to give a higher rent for premises he has occupied for some time, and where he has established a character, and has got into a line of business; he finds it worth his while to pay a higher rent for those than he would for premises he had to enter into in the first instance?—Yes.

5249. They are more valuable to him; he has made them more valuable by his trade?—Yes, in establishing a trade there.

5250. And a connexion?—Yes.

5251. Now that is described as a very good cellar; is it so?—It is.

5252. I believe there is more than one apartment?—There is.

5253. And I believe that has a window in it?—It has.

5254. A window is rather a luxury in a cellar; is it not?—Indeed it is; but that I think has two windows.

5255. Who is the occupier?—Charles Atcheson.

5256. Who did he vote for?—He voted for Mr. Bagwell.

5257. Then perhaps you will be surprised to hear that he considers that cellar worth 10*l*.?—Who?

5258. This Mr. Atcheson, who voted for Mr. Bagwell, and that he expressed himself so recently?—It would not surprise me his saying so at all.

5259. You would not say he would say so if he did not believe it?—Indeed I would; indeed I do believe that he would say so.

5260. What motive should prompt him to say so; the tenant, Shaughnessy, voted for Mr. Romayne; he himself votes for Mr. Bagwell; is it from a pure love of justice or disinterestedness, or what feeling is it that would make him say so?—I do not know that he has much feeling of that kind about him at all; he is a man of that character, that would tell different stories to different people.

5261. But could you assign any motive?—No.

5262. So that, without motive, he would represent this cellar to be worth 10*l*., although, in point of fact, he knew it was not, and he would do that without any earthly motive?—I think he would; he might have a motive; but I know he is a man who will tell two stories in one day.

5263. Mr. Hamilton.] He is a man who has a loose way of talking?—Yes.

5264. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And he would misrepresent the value of his property without any motive; do you say that?—Yes; if he was casually asked in that way, I think he would.

5265. That is what you would call a loose way of talking; a man who misrepresents

presents the value of his property without the least motive for doing so?—Yes, I call that a loose way of talking.

5266. Now, Cornelius O'Neil; you gave an account of his premises?—I did.

5267. Did you mention that he was dead?—I did.

5268. You stated, I believe, that his cellar was worth 8*l*.?—I did.

5269. It is not worth more; that is the utmost value?—I think it is.

5270. Then of course you would be very much surprised to hear he pays 10*l*. 10*s*. a year rent for it?—Indeed I would; I know it was one of the best fitted up cellars in Clonmel; that he had eight or ten beds in it, fitted up in the style of the cabin of a vessel, one over another; berths like, for lodgers; and that constituted its particular value, at the time beds were of value in Clonmel, but that has not been the case much of late years; they are not of the same degree of value they were some few years ago, this class of beds and this sort of place.

5271. There is a shop, is not there; the cellar is divided into a shop and other apartments?—Yes, the shop is a shelf or two at the bottom of the stairs, as you go in.

5272. That is what is called a shop in a cellar?—Yes.

5273. It is in Dublin-street?—Yes.

5274. A good situation?—Nearly opposite Abbey-street.

5275. Taking into account all those matters I have just stated, viz. that there is what they call a shop and other apartments, and that there are beds, and that the situation is excellent, will you not venture to say that they are worth 10*l*. a year?—I would not, because I give it in this point of view; suppose the present occupier to leave the cellar, and has taken his property with him out of it, and a stranger coming to it, he would not, I think, give more; any one inclined to pay would not give more than 8*l*.

5276. What, not if he were to succeed to his business, and have the benefit of these beds for lodgers?—I do not know; if he gave up his beds or the property he might; but if he took his own property to the cellar, it is not worth then more than 8*l*, in my estimation.

5277. In your judgment, is it worth 10*l*. to this man?—I cannot say; I suppose he makes more than 10*l*. of it.

5278. If a new tenant were coming in, would you say it was not worth more than 10*l*.?—I never took that into account.

5279. Have you stated that already?—I have.

5280. You have stated already that in valuing premises you never take into account any benefit that may be derived by the tenant from the possession?—Not any peculiar benefit.

5281. That you never take into any account anything but what was the intrinsic value of the premises?—The intrinsic value of the premises.

5282. So that although the premises are occupied as a lodging-house, and large profits made of it, and although they are occupied as a shop or as a workshop, and large profits are made of it, you do not take into account at all the amount of the profits, and you consider merely the intrinsic value of the house itself?—Exactly so.

5283. With respect to Shaughnessy's cellar, had you been in that?—I was.

5284. Often?—No, indeed.

5285. When were you in it last?—I was not in it these three years, I think, before.

5286. Then you are giving your recollection of the value that it appeared to you to have three years ago?—I have given it from a note I then took of what I conceived to have been the value of this cellar, and the size.

5287. Three years ago; I believe that was not very long after the last election?—It was about that time; it may have been more than three years since.

5288. Did you make that valuation for the purpose of objecting at the time of the registry?—Preparatory to coming to London on the petition.

5289. For the purpose of sustaining Mr. Bagwell's petition?—Yes, on his part.

5290. You made the valuation for that purpose?—I did.

5291. I believe party ran pretty high at that time in Clonmel?—I think the rents given were as high as they are now.

5292. But it ran pretty high then?—It did.

5293. And you made the valuation with a view to give evidence to sustain

Mr. Geo. Graham.

19 April 1837.

Mr. Bagwell's petition, and to get rid of Mr. Ronayne?—Not for the purpose of getting rid of Mr. Ronayne, but for the purpose, if I were called upon, I might state to the best of my knowledge the true value; not for the purpose of getting rid of Mr. Ronayne, and sustaining Mr. Bagwell.

5294. You did it with a view to give the result of your judgment as to the value of the premises to support Mr. Bagwell's petition?—Yes, if the thing was under value.

5295. And the evidence you have given to-day with respect to that cellar and other premises has been from the notes which you took under those circumstances?—It was, in some cases; I have since looked; I cannot say I have revised any, but confirmed my own opinion that my first judgment was correct.

5296. You cannot say you have altered any?—No.

5297. But you confirmed your opinion in some instances that your first judgment at the time you describe was correct; is that so?—That is quite right.

5298. So that the evidence which you have given to-day is the result of your judgment as to the value of the premises you have been speaking of, that judgment formed at the time when you were employed in investigating the value of the premises, for the purpose of supporting the petition?—Yes, when I was led to understand or told I would be summoned here to London with respect to these cellars, it was then I formed my opinion.

5299. That was in 1833?—I believe it was; three or four years since.

5300. *Chairman.*] Were you examined before the Committee or not?—I was.

5301. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Now, with respect to John Smith; you have stated that from 6*l.* to 7*l.* is the value of his cellar; was it at the same period that you valued that?—Yes, about the same period.

5302. Now, I believe that is a good cellar?—It is; you do not happen to live so far, if I may use the expression, or at least go down so low to it; it is not so much buried as the other.

5303. It is nearer the surface?—It is.

5304. Then is the bedroom inside?—Yes.

5305. Beds for lodgers?—Very small one; because it is only half the length of the hall, and just the breadth of it.

5306. Would you be surprised to hear that there were four beds in that room?—No, not a bit; because I know this class of people do sleep in places half the size of this place I am sitting in.

5307. Do you happen to know that there is one lodger continually there, paying 1*s.* 6*d.* per week?—No, I do not.

5308. Do you know there is a public wash?—I do.

5309. That is a source of profit?—It is, or ought to be, at least.

5310. Do you know the rent?—I do not.

5311. What would you suppose to be the rent?—I should suppose it does not exceed the value I state it to be.

5312. Then you take the rent to be the full value there?—Yes.

5313. Is that your general rule?—It is my general rule.

5314. Whatever a man pays for rent?—No; it is what the thing will bring in the market.

5315. You take the rent to be 6*l.* or 7*l.*?—That is what I conceive to be the value.

5316. Then I am asking you whether it is your general rule to consider the rent paid by the tenant as the value of the premises?—No; I do not know what the tenant pays.

5317. But I asked you that, and you said you supposed he paid from 6*l.* to 7*l.*?—I state that as the value of it.

5318. I asked you what rent do you suppose he pays?—I do not know what rent he pays.

5319. Could you not form any guess?—I could not; the only guess I can form is from my own judgment of what I conceive to be about the value of the premises in the market.

5320. You cannot form any judgment of the rent; accordingly, when you are putting a value on those premises as you are now, you are not considering what rent they pay?—No.

5321. You do not take that into account at all?—I do not.

5322. Then is it your impression that the amount of the rent paid is no criterion

criterion of value?—It is not my impression, because it may be in some instances; in some instances I have inquired of the landlord what the tenant paid after forming my own judgment; and in these instances I found they always paid less than I valued them at.

5323. Then is it not your opinion, as the result of those inquiries, that, generally speaking, the rent paid does not constitute the full value; you have stated now, that in several instances, after forming your own judgment as to the value of the premises, you have inquired of the landlord?—In some instances.

5324. Well, in some instances, you have inquired what rent was paid?—Yes.

5325. And in those instances you found less rent was paid than you considered to have been the value?—I did.

5326. Now, do you not draw then this result from that circumstance, that the rent paid is, generally speaking, under the value?—Yes; in other words, that I have valued those places to the utmost that they would bear, if in the market.

5327. And the rent is not the utmost value?—Not in that case; I cannot take upon me to say that in all cases.

5328. But we have got so far, that there are cases within your experience in which the rent paid for the premises is not the full value; is it not so?—Yes, I think so; not the full value.

5329. You have put the full value yourself?—I have, what I conceive to be the full value in my judgment; the thing might bring more in the market.

5330. What I wish to put to you is this, you have formed your judgment as to the value of the premises in the first instance?—I have.

5331. Then inquired of the landlord what rent was paid for them?—Yes.

5332. And you have found that less rent was paid than the value you put upon them?—I have, in some instances.

5333. Then there are instances within your own experience and observation, in which the rent paid for the premises is not the full value?—According to my judgment.

5334. *Chairman.*] In forming your valuation of these premises, were you anxious to put as high a value as in your judgment they were capable of fetching in the market?—I was, in every instance.

5335. Were you desirous of rather erring on the side of putting a high value than on the side of a low one?—I was, all through, without any exception, according to my own judgment.

5336. In forming your estimation of the value of the premises, did you consider the proper criterion to be what you as a landlord would accept for them, and what a good tenant would give for them?—I considered it to be quite as much as any tenant that would pay, would at all give in any instance.

5337. Are you the proprietor of any houses in the town of Clonmel?—Not of any that have cellars that are set.

5338. But in letting the houses that you have in Clonmel, do you consider the value which you obtain from them the real value of the houses?—I do.

5339. And in putting that value upon the houses, do you take into account such a circumstance as a party having a mangle or anything else of that sort, by which he may get his livelihood?—I do not; I would not take that into account, because I take it, that people in different branches of business may, by industry, make money; that I do not think I would be justifiable in stamping a rent upon their industry, more than the mere value of the premises in the market.

5340. If you were to let a house with a mangle, you would charge something extra for the mangle?—If it was my own, I might charge for it.

5341. But if the mangle was not your own, you would not consider that because it happened to be there it increased the value which you, as landlord, would claim?—I would not.

5342. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Do you consider that the circumstance or the accident of the mangle being in a house forms a constituency of the intrinsic value of that house?—I do not.

5343. *Mr. Sergeant Ball.*] But do you consider the circumstance of a house having become the resort for some years of persons who want to get linen mangled; having become the resort of those persons, having got a name for mangling, that does not constitute any additional value to the house, if taken by a person who does not go into the same line of trade?—I doubt it, if it was in Clonmel; if it was in

Mr. Geo. Graham.

19 April 1837.

London or Dublin, or a large city, I think it might have some effect on the establishment, but in Clonmel I do not conceive that any branch of business that I know of can be worth 5 l. in addition. What I mean to say is, that supposing any shopkeeper in Clonmel moved out of the house he was now in, well established, and a good business, if he moved to any other part of Clonmel he would do as well; that he would not leave any particular value after him in that business he left.

5344. But suppose a shopkeeper in extensive business to-day, his shop the resort of country people coming in on market-days; do you mean to say there would be no additional value acquired by that house from the circumstance of his having carried on a prosperous and extensive trade there for several years, and that a future occupier would not be disposed to give more for the house if he meant to go into the same line of business in the house so occupied?—The future occupier very likely would prefer a place occupied in a similar line.

5345. Would he not give more?—I should think he would.

5346. Then that would constitute some additional value?—That would constitute some additional value, but that difference is very little with the humbler class of dwellings.

5347. Then it is your opinion that a house acquires additional value from having been a place where a prosperous and extensive trade has been carried on for some time?—Yes; but, as I have already remarked in a reply to a question, I do not think in the best establishment in Clonmel that it would make a difference of 5 l. a year in the value.

5348. To whom?—To the first class of houses in Clonmel, for another person succeeding in a similar line of business.

5349. That is to say, it is your opinion that if the most extensive and the most prosperous shopkeeper in Clonmel were to die to-morrow, and if his house was to be let to another occupier, and if that occupier meant to go into the same line of business precisely as his predecessor, that the new occupier would not give more than 5 l. a year additional for the advantage he would acquire by succeeding the former occupier in the same premises?—I do not think that an individual would give half that sum, except for the sake of the fittings that there may be in the shop.

5350. Do you mean for the goodwill of the trade?—Yes.

5351. It is your judgment, therefore, that the goodwill of the most prosperous trade in Clonmel is not worth to any man 5 l. a year; is that your judgment; in one house more than another?—Yes, it is.

5352. In order to illustrate it, I put the case distinctly of a man either dying or giving up the trade; take the most prosperous shopkeeper dying or leaving the trade, your opinion is, that if he came to let his house to a person succeeding him in the same trade, that person would not give as much as 5 l. a year additional for getting into those premises instead of setting up business in premises which had never been occupied in that line before?—Not more than the intrinsic value of the premises themselves, independent of that line of business.

5353. Then he would not give 5 l. a year more for premises in which he may have succeeded the former occupier, than he would for premises in which he began trade for the first time?—I cannot say what another might do, but I would not.

5354. But what is your opinion of people?—My opinion is, they would not; people generally.

5355. Does it not follow from that, that the goodwill of the most prosperous trade in Clonmel is not worth to any man 5 l. a year; you see what I mean by the goodwill?—Yes, that is carrying on a particular establishment.

5356. That it is not worth 5 l. a year?—Not a particular establishment; a particular house; that is the impression on my mind.

5357. *Chairman.*] Now, what do you mean by goodwill?—What I understand from the gentleman who examined me is, a particular interest arising from a particular class of customers frequenting that one establishment.

5358. Do you mean to say that the goodwill of a firm, or a trade, or a shopkeeper, may not be independent of the particular house in which he resides?—Not in Clonmel; in larger places it would; in London it would; in Dublin it would make a material difference, and in Cork; and in Limerick; the more you get down to small towns in our country, the less value, in the south of Ireland.

5359. My

5359. My question is, may not the goodwill of a trade be independent of the particular house in which it is carried on?—I think so.

5360. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then I understand you to say, that that would be the case in London, Dublin, or Cork, but not so in Clonmel?—No.

5361. Chairman.] My question is, supposing a linen-draper to live at No. 6, Main-street, Clonmel, and he wishes to sell his trade to another party (the goodwill of that trade), that other party living in No. 7, would that make any difference as to the value of the goodwill, the moving from the one place to the other?—I do not think it would make any difference.

5362. Is not the goodwill of a trade generally understood to be the advantage of obtaining the same customers as the party selling that goodwill has heretofore had?—So I understand.

5363. And is that not the goodwill then, distinct from the house in which the individual has been carrying on his trade?—Distinct from the house in large places where the individual is not known, but the number and the particular position of the concern, then it may constitute a value upon a house; if you see number 'such a place,' without knowing the person or the occupier, then you go to such a number to buy goods; in that case, I think it constitutes a separate value on the house; but when you go to a person, and know the person, which is the case in all the small towns I am acquainted with, if that person moves into another corner of the town or street, he does just as much business in his establishment there as the one he left, and the one that he left is of no more value.

5364. Mr. Hamilton.] So that the goodwill follows the individual?—Yes.

5365. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] I am putting the case in which the individual was supposed to give up trade or died, then that trade must either remain where it was before, or it must go elsewhere?—Yes.

5366. Now I ask you, do not you consider it would remain in the case I put of a man dying or giving up trade, that it would remain in the premises where it was originally formed?—I do not think it would.

5367. And you do not think a single customer would be inclined to remain?—I do not say that; there may be some exceptions; but I understand you to speak generally.

5368. I do. Then you do conceive that some customers would remain merely through love of the premises?—I doubt if one would through love of the premises.

5369. Then do you believe any customer would be likely to remain?—Not through love of the premises.

5370. Through any motive?—Except some motives might arise with respect to the individual that came to occupy it, except they found that they had derived advantage by dealing at that establishment.

5371. But suppose they found they derived advantage by dealing there for a long series of years before the proprietor dies or gives up trade, he is succeeded by another, do you mean to say, that the customers would not for the most part continue to deal at the same premises until they found that they were not dealing on the same favourable terms they had been dealing there before?—I doubt it very much; I do not think there is such a thing as fixed customers at all in those small towns, because I do not believe persons would walk all over Clonmel for the saving of 30 per cent. on the money they would lay out.

5372. But in Clonmel, as in every other place, there must be some establishments which are considerably more extensive in their dealings; that is to say, would sell much more than others; take the case of one of those; take the case of the most extensive establishment in Clonmel, in order to try the principle, and in that case, supposing the proprietor to give up trade, do you mean to say, that the customers who are in the habit of dealing in that shop, will not for the most part continue dealing there with the new proprietor, if they find they are as well treated by him as they were by the old?—If they find they are as well treated they will, perhaps.

5373. They will not go elsewhere?—I cannot say.

5374. If they find they are as well treated, is not that natural to suppose?—It is very natural to suppose.

5375. That is what I call the goodwill of the trade. Then you do conceive that there is such a thing as the goodwill of a trade annexed to the premises, and not following the person?—I do, in some degree; I have said so.

Mr. Geo. Graham.
19 April 1837.

5376. And that, I presume, must be of some value?—No question it may be of some value.
5377. But do you still adhere to the opinion that it is not worth 5*l*. in any one instance in Clonmel?—Undoubtedly I do.
5378. Mr. *Hogg*.] You have stated what you understand by goodwill; wills me to ask, if the proprietor dies, would that goodwill survive to the establishment if a stranger succeeded?—I rather think not.
5379. Do you think that the proprietor while living could sell and transfer to a stranger for a valuable consideration the goodwill of his business?—I do not think in Clonmel he could.
5380. I am limiting the question to Clonmel?—I think not.
5381. And you found that opinion upon the habit of persons in Clonmel going from establishment to establishment, where they can get the best article on the cheapest terms?—Just so.
5382. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Did you not tell me just now, with regard to the proprietor of an extensive establishment in Clonmel, you consider that the customers of that establishment, speaking generally, would continue to deal at the same establishment as long as they found they were equally well treated?—I really do not know what they might do.
5383. Did you not tell me so?—I said it was likely they would so long as they found the same class of dealing in the same establishment.
5384. Then does it not result from that of necessity, that the goodwill of the trade does survive in that case?—I have not denied that at all; I said in a very small degree.
5385. Then you think it may survive in a small degree?—It may in a small degree; it is not for me to say what the public may think of such matters.
5386. Then your answer to the question whether in Clonmel the goodwill of a trade survived the death of the proprietor of an establishment, as I understood you, now should be, that it does survive in a small degree?—I think it may in a small degree; I think so.
5387. That is to say, that the customers of the establishment will continue dealing there as long as they find they are as well treated as they were in the lifetime of the former occupier?—I think so; but really a great deal depends on the person who comes to occupy the premises.
5388. I am assuming there is no personal motive for dealing with the successor?—If not, I think it will be likely that a good many might.
5389. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Your notion of intrinsic value is what the thing will bring in the market?—It is, decidedly.
5390. Intrinsic value may be increased by the advantage of situation?—Yes; and I look upon it that it is.
5391. If there be a goodwill unconnected with the person who may have occupied a house, by appertaining to the house, does not that kind of advantage, in your opinion, class itself among the advantages connected with locality?—I do not quite comprehend the question.
5392. If there be a goodwill which belongs to a house independent of the possessor of that house, does it appear to you that that is an advantage coming under the class of advantages belonging to situation?—I do not value the premises higher for that.
5393. *Chairman*.] But taking the lower class of houses, viz. those at 10*l*. and under, do you consider there the goodwill of much importance?—I do not at all.
5394. Of less importance than that which is attributed to the other class of houses?—Yes, proportionably less.
5395. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] But there is such a thing, I suppose, as the lower class of people resorting to the same cellar, for instance, to try the lowest description of establishment; such a thing as customers being in the habit of resorting to the same cellar to buy the same wares?—I really do not know.
5396. Have you any doubt about it?—I think really they go to the people whom they know; not to a particular cellar.
5397. But is there nothing in the habit of going to the same local spot?—Almost all the cellars in Clonmel are of the same class of business; the great majority of them are.
5398. And for that reason, if you can suppose for one moment you were in that class of life, if you were in the habit of resorting to the same cellar for some time, is it not natural to suppose you would continue to resort there, although the proprietor

proprietor was changed?—Decidedly I would; but if the proprietor of that is dead or gone, or if the proprietor of that moves into another cellar in another street, the goodwill would follow.

5399. But we are talking of personal goodwill, which I will call local; I am speaking of that; it is that case I put; why would not the lower class of people, as well as the better class, have the same disposition to continue dealing at the same place if they found they were equally well treated?—The impression on my mind is that they will, if they are as well or better treated.

5400. If they are, you think they will continue to deal there?—I think they care very little where they deal; but they will continue where they conceive they get the best value.

5401. *Chairman.*] That being your opinion, if you wanted to let a cellar you would take care to have as much rent as you could get for it?—I would.

5402. And the party taking it would also consider these advantages, and would advance his terms accordingly?—I should think so.

5403. Therefore it comes back to the original proposition, that you admit the value of property to be that which one party is giving and the other party is taking?—Yes.

5404. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] But in estimating the value of property, you do not take into account at all what has been called the goodwill of the trade?—I do not, because I do not conceive it is of any value.

5405. Are you a freeman?—I am not.

Mr. Michael Gliscan, called in; and Examined.

5406. *Chairman.*] WHAT are you?—I hold the situation of deputy clerk of the peace for the county of Tipperary.

5407. Where do you reside?—I reside at Clonmel when at home.

5408. What profession are you of?—I am not of any particular profession.

5409. Are you a solicitor?—No, I am not.

5410. Are you a shopkeeper?—I have a shop.

5411. What do you sell in that shop?—I sell groceries.

5412. And spirits?—And spirits; I do not attend to it myself.

5413. Do you produce the book of the registry of Clonmel from the office of the clerk of the peace?—I do.

5414. Put it in, will you?—[*The same was put in.*]

5415. To what date does that registry come?—To the 31st of December last.

5416. Has there been no registry since the 31st of December?—There has.

5417. Why did not you bring the registry to the present time?—They are made out annually.

5418. Have you no registry subsequent to the 31st of December in your possession?—No.

5419. Has no registry subsequent to the 31st December come into the office of the clerk of the peace for the county of Tipperary?—It has.

5420. In whose possession is that?—The clerk of the peace.

5421. Were you not desired to bring with you the registry up to the present period?—No.

5422. Were any orders given you to bring the registry?—I got no orders to bring any registry, but to attend this Committee.

5423. *Mr. Hamilton.*] What number were registered at the January sessions?—At the January sessions I think about 10; not the January, the April sessions; they were at Clonmel the 28th of March.

5424. What signature is there to that?—Thomas Sadleir.

5425. Clerk of the peace?—Yes.

5426. You are his deputy?—Yes.

5427. When is that made up to?—Up to the 31st of December.

5428. Although it is dated 13th January?—Yes.

5429. Are you aware of the contents of the book just put into your hands?—I cannot say I am, of the contents of this book.

5430. Is that book the official registry which has been printed under the superintendance of the clerk of the peace for the county Tipperary or not?—It is.

5431. Was that book correct up to the period of the date in question?—No.

5432. Why

Mr. Geo. Osborne.

19 April 1837.

*Mr.
Michael Gliscan.*

Mr.
Michael Gilman.
19 April 1837.

5432. Why was it not correct?—It was never revised since 1832; since the original registry by the assisting barrister.

5433. Was there a book similar to that delivered out from the clerk of the peace's office to parties applying for the registry?—I believe there was.

5434. Then is it as correct as the public can get from the clerk of the peace's office up to that period?—It is.

5435. In what particular is it incorrect?—Those who have left and have died, their names still remain in the registry.

5436. How do you know there is that incorrectness in the book?—Because I have a copy of it here.

5437. Do the deaths and change of residence, and so forth, appear in that other book of yours?—They appear from my own minutes; I have taken minutes for myself for my own private information.

5438. Are your minutes public minutes, taken for the public, or private minutes, taken for your own purpose?—Taken for a public purpose, that if called on they should be shown.

5439. When was that book printed that you hold in your hand, which you say is incorrect?—This was printed some time in the month of January, I believe.

5440. It bears date the 13th January?—It does.

5441. Then if you took these minutes for the purpose of public information, how came you to issue from the clerk of the peace the book which you state is incorrect and a contradiction of those minutes?—I never issued this book.

5442. Who did issue it?—The clerk of the peace.

5443. Are you not his deputy?—I am.

5444. Do you not represent him?—No, I do not know that I do here.

5445. Why, then, in what respect are you his deputy?—I attend his official business; but of the issuing of this book I know nothing till I saw it here.

5446. You attend his official business?—Yes.

5447. What official business?—Quarter sessions.

5448. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Is that in court?—Yes.

5449. The books are issued in the office?—Yes.

5450. Which is not in the court?—Which is not in the court.

5451. Mr. Hamilton.] When you say that is incorrect, do you mean incorrect as to the list of the voters as they actually exist?—That it contains more than the present number.

5452. But is it correct as a copy of the list which the clerk of the peace has in his office?—It is correct.

5453. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] What you mean, when you say that you have made minutes or private memorandums, which you have no objection to make public if required, I take to be this; do you mean to say, that in the discharge of your duty as deputy clerk of the peace, it is any part of your duty to make these minutes or memorandums or to correct that list?—Not the list.

5454. Then if you have taken up a copy and made minutes or corrections of it, that is no part of your duty, but those are your own private memorandums?—Private memorandums of my own.

5455. Then these minutes or memorandums amount to this, as you state it, namely, the instances in which persons have removed from their premises, out of which they registered, and the instances in which they died; is it not so?—Yes.

5456. Because in those instances their names, in strictness, ought not to appear on the registry?—No.

5457. But I believe there is no power either in the clerk of the peace or any functionary in Ireland to alter the list or to strike out those names, as far as you know?—There is a power, I believe, in the Reform Bill that the assisting barrister should revise them annually.

5458. Do you mean in Ireland?—Yes.

5459. Chairman.] Then I am to understand, that although that book which I have put into your hands is a correct copy, the official copy, printed under the direction of the clerk of the peace, it does not give accurate information as to who has the right to vote either in Clonmel or any other part of the county Tipperary?—It does not.

5460. That does not arise from any laches on the part of the clerk of the peace or other parties, but it arises from the state of the law; is that it?—I cannot

cannot say it arises from any neglect of the clerk of the peace, for he has no power of revising.

5461. Has any other party the power of revising excepting the House of Commons?—Not that I am aware of.

5462. Now, can you state, by comparison of your own memoranda with that printed book of the clerk of the peace, what persons appear wrongly registered on the printed book?—I can.

5463. Can you state them regularly; have you made an accurate inspection of the book?—I have drawn the pen across the names of those persons who have either died or changed their residences.

5464. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Are they very numerous?—They are about 200, I should think.

5465. You would have to strike out about 200 names?—I have them struck out already in my own list.

5466. Mr. Hamilton.]—So that in the registry now there are 200 names of persons whose qualifications have ceased?—There are upwards of 200, I should think.

5467. And that out of a constituency of how many?—Out of, I suppose, 800 and odd.

The Witness was directed to withdraw and put a mark against the names of those persons who had either died or changed their residences.

Mr. Edward Labarte, called in; and Examined.

5468. Chairman.] YOU are a solicitor?—I am.

5469. You reside in the town of Clonmel?—I do.

5470. Are you also town-clerk?—I am.

5471. You succeeded your father in that office?—I did.

5472. How long have you been town-clerk?—Since the year 1819.

5473. Were you in the habit of assisting your father before you became town-clerk yourself?—I occasionally did.

5474. Have you brought over the list of the freemen of Clonmel?—I have.

5475. Have you got it with you?—It is at my lodgings.

5476. Can you state what the number of freemen is?—There are about 160, I dare say.

5477. You have made a return to an order of this Committee of all the freemen admitted, have you not, since the 11th May 1832?—I believe I have.

5478. Is that a correct return?—I believe it is.

5479. Mr. Hamilton.] You were concerned, I believe, in 1832, in opposing the claims of those who were supposed to be fictitious claimants to register?—Yes, I was.

5480. You were also engaged on Mr. Bagwell's side at the two contested elections for Clonmel?—I was.

5481. And at the petition to the House of Commons against the return of Mr. Bonayne?—I was.

5482. In May 1833; were you in court during the registry of 1832?—I was part of the time; most part of the time.

5483. Several of the witnesses, I believe, declined giving evidence after the first day's examination?—Why, I do not believe they declined.

5484. Was it thought unnecessary or inadvisable to examine them?—It was thought useless to examine them.

5485. On what ground?—On the ground that their evidence was not attended to.

5486. Chairman.] Not attended to by whom?—Not attended to by the registering barrister.

5487. Did he refuse to receive evidence?—He did not refuse to receive evidence, but it had no effect upon him.

5488. Did he attach any value to the evidence?—I think not.

5489. Mr. Hamilton.] On what account did he attach no value to the evidence?—He did not mind it; it did not weigh with him.

5490. Did he give any reasons for not minding it?—He said he was sent to open the borough, and as far as he had power, he would.

5491. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did he say he would not mind the evidence?—No, he did not.

a. 89.

X X 2

5492. Did

Mr.
Michael Glavin.
19 April 1837

Mr. Edw. Labarte.

Mr. Edw. Leabarte.

19 April 1837.

5492. Did he say anything tantamount to that?—No; but he did not pay attention to it, I think.

5493. That is to say, in your opinion, he ought to have given more weight to the evidence than he did?—I think he ought.

5494. In the particular cases in which the evidence was given?—Yes.

5495. And you differed in opinion from him as to the effect of the evidence?—Yes, that was my feeling.

5496. He was deciding against your party, or your client; Mr. Bagwell was your client?—Yes.

5497. His decision was against him?—It was.

5498. And, in your judgment, he ought to have given more weight to the evidence adduced on behalf of your client?—Yes.

5499. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Can you state the nature of the evidence given in the particular cases to which you allude, on both sides, in favour of the claim, and against it?—Indeed, it is so long since, that I cannot; the time is too far gone, I think.

5500. Was there any conflicting evidence with reference to the facts?—I believe they did produce conflicting evidence.

5501. Then was it that the barrister discredited one set of witnesses and credited the other, or that you differed with respect to the principle of his decision?—I think, as to value, he thought that the man was the best judge of his own affairs.

5502. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] But you do not mean to say he did not receive evidence, or that he would not receive it if offered to disprove the testimony of the claimant himself?—He did receive evidence, but it had not the weight, as I said.

5503. And, as I understand you, he seemed to think that the man himself was a better judge of the value of the premises which the man occupied than strangers could be?—He did; that is the effect of it.

5504. And accordingly, whenever he was satisfied that the man himself was telling him the truth, he did not attach the weight to the evidence of strangers who came to contradict the statement of the claimants which you considered he might or ought to have done; is that the result of what you say?—Yes; I think that would be the result of it.

5505. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Do you recollect whether the tenor of the evidence of the claimants was, that the premises were intrinsically worth 10*l.*, or worth 10*l.* to them?—It was worth 10*l.* to them; that was always qualified in that way.

5506. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] When you say "always," you do not mean "always"—I will not say "always" exactly, but in most cases.

5507. But in most cases; just recollect yourself for a moment; do not you recollect there were several cases in which that qualification was not made by the claimant; many cases in which men came to register, and did not confine their statement of the value in the way you now mention?—Indeed, I think they qualified in most of them, that it was worth it to them.

5508. Then do you mean to say that persons whose premises were of the undoubted value of 10*l.* and upwards, that they also qualified their statement in the way you mention; persons whose premises were worth 20*l.* a year, when they came to register, that, in answer to the question put to them by the barrister, they confined their statement of the value to what it was worth to them, and did not state generally it was worth it; is that your recollection?—It is so long ago I really do not like to press my opinion upon it.

5509. Your impression, however, is, that all the claimants, no matter what the value of their premises was, made that statement; is that your impression?—No; I would not say all.

5510. Nearly all?—Nor nearly all.

5511. But your impression is, that some of the claimants, at least, whose premises were of the value of 10*l.* and upwards, notoriously so, still, when they came to state their value to the barrister, qualified their statement in the way you mentioned?—No; I would not say that.

5512. Then what class of persons was it that qualified?—I would rather say they were the lower order.

5513. Now you must have had occasion to have considerable intercourse with that class, either professionally or otherwise; they must have come in your way. Are you aware that it is a common practice among the lower order of people, when

when they are asked the value of the premises they occupy, not for the purpose of registry, to state the value in the qualified way you mention, namely, the premises are worth so much "to me"; I speak of that class of people who have never had occasion to let them, or to offer them to be let; are you aware that it is a very common practice with them to speak with some caution of the value, and to say "They are worth that to me, intimating, I cannot tell what another person may be disposed to give for them, because I never offered them to be let; but I know what they are worth that to me; I can state that unhesitatingly, but I cannot state what another man would give for them, because I never offered them;" now, from your experience and knowledge of these people, have you any doubt that that is a common practice amongst them?—No, I have not.

5514. Or that it sometimes occurs?—It may occur, but I do not know that.

5515. You conceive that a man of that class of life would hesitate to say, "I never had occasion to offer the premises I live in; I cannot, therefore, tell what a third person would be disposed to give me for them; if you ask me that question, I cannot tell; but if you ask me what is their value to me, I can answer that, because I know it"?—They qualified in most cases, saying, they are worth that "to me," I would not "give" it for less.

5516. But I am asking you to account for their qualifying in that way; can you account for it in the way I am now endeavouring to explain it; do not you think what I am now saying is a natural feeling enough for a man to entertain?—I cannot exactly say.

5517. Supposing it were your own case, would not that be a natural feeling for you to entertain?—It would be natural; I would not, perhaps, give it for 10*l.*, though it may not be worth it.

5518. And why would you not give it for 10*l.*; "because it is worth more than 10*l.* to me;" how can you in that way account for these qualified answers which you state were given to the barrister when he inquired about the value?—I cannot account for it.

5519. Would you consider that a reasonable way of accounting for it; is it not natural, and therefore probable and reasonable?—It is natural, certainly.

5520. And therefore not unreasonable?—I think persons living in a place not worth 10*l.* would think it worth 10*l.* to them.

5521. They would, if it were worth 10*l.*?—They would not give it for 10*l.*; they may not pay 10*l.* for it.

5522. They may not have been ever offered 10*l.*, and yet that will be matter of speculation as to what they might be offered for it, or disposed to give for it; but it is no speculation when they say, I know not by conjecture or speculation, but I know from my own knowledge what it is worth to me. Now take the lower class of people that I have been alluding to, can there be anything more natural than that, when asked the value of their premises, they should answer in that way?—I can conceive persons very well saying they would not give their place for 10*l.*

5523. Why not, because it is worth more than 10*l.* to "me"?—That would be the inference you would draw.

5524. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Do you conceive it follows at all necessarily, from that, that the premises must be worth 10*l.*?—It may not be worth 10*l.*, perhaps, to another, but it would to them.

5525. *Chairman*.] Is it not always worth while for a man, if he is residing in a place, to pay rather more than the actual value of the place than change constantly?—If he be established there, I should suppose so.

5526. Without reference to trade, or anything else but the mere fact of changing, is it not a loss to the individual?—It may be a loss to him.

5527. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] That is when the rent is raised after he is gone into it; but is it worth his while, when he goes in in the first instance, to pay more than that?—No, I think not.

5528. *Chairman*.] When he first goes in, every man pays what he conceives to be the value of the place, does he not?—Yes.

5529. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Every man would get it as cheap as he could?—Yes.

5530. *Chairman*.] And the landlord lets it as dear as he can; is not that the case?—Yes, I should think so.

5531. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] But there is such a thing as a landlord being willing to

Mr. Edw. Lobbart.

to take a lower rent from a very solvent, industrious, respectable tenant, than he would require from one who is not so?—Certainly, I should think so.

19 April 1837.

5532. And of course that feeding operates in Clonmel, as well as elsewhere?—Certainly.

5533. *Chairman.*] In letting houses, as in all other transactions of that nature, the risk of what is called bad debts is taken into account, is it not?—I should think so.

5534. *Mr. Hamilton.*] The petition against Mr. Rowayne was unsuccessful?—It was.

5535. Can you state on what ground it failed?—The Committee, I believe, required more than we could do.

5536. What did they require which you could not do?—They required a class of evidence which we were not able to go into; and having 50 votes to reduce, we thought it would be ruinous to think of it almost.

5537. What was the class of evidence they required which you could not produce?—They first said they would go into objected votes at the registry; we then sent to Dublin for the opposing barrister, Mr. Welch; and after Mr. Welch had given his evidence, then there was some other objection; but Mr. Welch and I dined together that day, and we resolved upon meeting the London lawyers, and advising that Mr. Bagwell should go no further; and upon that evidence he did give it up, on our recommendation.

5538. But the Committee refused to open the registry, except where objections had been made at the time of the registry?—At the time of the registry.

5539. Then you were not able to prove as many cases as were desired, that objections had been made to at the time of the registry?—Why it was some months before the objections were made, and Mr. Welch was obliged to stop going into evidence, after he considered it not attended to by the barrister.

5540. Now, in consequence of the principle upon which Mr. Guthrie decided, is it your opinion that an inferior class of voters exist now in Clonmel?—I do think (the first registry) that if there were some of them knocked off, it would be beneficial to all parties.

5541. *Chairman.*] But do you mean to say there are voters, in your opinion, upon the registry in consequence of Mr. Guthrie's proceeding at that first registration, who were not entitled under the Act of Parliament to vote?—I do.

5542. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] That is your inference, from the general impression you formed of Mr. Guthrie's registry?—Yes.

5543. *Mr. Hamilton.*] You have no doubt that there are many on the list of voters who do not occupy houses intrinsically worth 10 £?—I have not.

5544. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] That also is a general impression you have?—It is.

5545. You never valued the houses?—I did not value them.

5546. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Now I presume, if the law had required, as it does in England, or admitted, as it does in England, of an annual revision of the list of voters, the difficulty which you experienced before the Committee would not have arisen?—No, I think it would not.

5547. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Do you recollect what was the general character of the objections made at the registry, to claimants who came to register, any given class of objection?—Under-value was the principal objection taken.

5548. Was any other objection taken?—I think that was the principal class of objection.

5549. But do you remember any other; you were the solicitor concerned for Mr. Bagwell?—Yes, I was so.

5550. Now give us any other objection but under-value?—There were objections to freemen, on his part.

5551. That is, on the other side?—Yes.

5552. But I mean any objection made on the part of Mr. Bagwell, save under-value?—Indeed I think that was the principal objection.

5553. But do you recollect any other; could you venture to say it was the only objection?—No, I would not.

5554. Then do you recollect if there was any other, and what was it?—There were double persons voting out of places.

5555. That is to say, more than one person voting out of the same premises; was that objection taken?—Yes, I think it was.

5556. Do you recollect any other objection?—I do not.

5557. The

5557. Then your impression is that no other objection was taken but those two; there is no record of the objections, you know?—No, I believe no record of them.

5558. Then your recollection is, as far as you can recollect the thing, that those were the only two classes of objection that were taken?—No voting out of the same place.

5559. Yes, two or more voting out of the same premises?—Yes, I think they occurred on both sides.

5560. Yes, but I am speaking of objections taken on the part of Mr. Bagwell, and there were only those two classes?—Indeed I believe those were all.

5561. Now Mr. Hobson succeeded Mr. Guthrie; that is to say, he was the next to register?—He was.

5562. And Mr. Howley succeeded Mr. Hobson?—Yes.

5563. I believe that whatever objections were taken to Mr. Guthrie's registry, that all parties were satisfied with Mr. Hobson's and Mr. Howley's?—Indeed I think they are.

5564. There are no complaints against them for registering men who had not sufficient value?—No, I think there was no objection to them. I think they pleased both sides.

5565. Do you happen to know, that both Mr. Hobson and Mr. Howley have registered the occupiers of cellars?—I believe Mr. Hobson did in one instance, one instance in the Main-street; it was under where Mr. Needham lived; he is dead since. But that cellar was registered; a Mr. Smith, I think, was the occupier of it. I paid 10 l. a year myself for it.

5566. You paid 10 l. a year yourself for this?—I did; I took it for a nurse.

5567. So that, then, I think I have your practice, at least, to warrant me in saying that these cellars in Clonmel, which at first, from your statement, would appear to be premises not worth 10 l. a year rent, are in point of fact, in many instances, worth it?—I will not say in many instances.

5568. In one instance you paid it yourself?—I did, myself, in that instance. It is the best cellar in Clonmel, I should think.

5569. Do you know the cellar under Mr. Hackett's?—Yes; and I just heard from himself now, that he gets 12 l. a year for it; it is a double cellar, a good cellar.

5570. And I believe he did get 20 l.?—I do not know; I heard him say he got 14 l., and reduced it himself to 12 l.

5571. Mr. Howilton.] But speaking generally of cellars in Clonmel, should you say they are over or under 10 l. value?—I think them under value for 10 l.

5572. Do you mean to say they do not pay 10 l. a year rent?—I think a great number of them do not.

5573. But when you speak of the value of cellars and other premises out of which parties have registered, do you mean the rent they pay?—I mean to say they do not pay 10 l. rent.

5574. And then, when you find they do not pay 10 l. a year rent, you conclude that they are not of the value of 10 l.?—I believe there are many cellars not the value for 10 l.

5575. But if I mentioned any particular cellar which does not pay 10 l. a year rent, would it be your conclusion that it was not of the value of 10 l., because it did not pay 10 l. a year rent; in other words, do you consider rent and value as synonymous, as meaning the same thing?—No, I do not.

5576. Then, is it your principle, or your notion, that the premises may be of much higher value than the rent they pay?—I think there are cellars not worth 10 l., but I believe there are three or four in the town worth 10 l.

5577. But put cellars out of the way, I am speaking of premises generally, I am alluding now to over-ground premises, and not cellars; if you find a particular house does not pay 10 l. a year rent, do you conclude it is not of the value of 10 l.?—No, I would not conclude that exactly; but I do conceive persons have voted out of places worth 3 l. and 4 l.

5578. You have been asked whether it was your general impression that there were persons on the register in Clonmel whose premises were not worth 10 l. a year; you stated it was, and that there are persons registered voters who are not entitled to vote, by reason of their premises not being of the value required by the Act of Parliament; you stated that was your impression?—Yes.

5579. Now, I want to test that, and I am asking you whether, if you find a house

Mr. Es'te. Laberte.

21 April 1837.

house does not pay 10 *l.* a year rent, you infer it is not of the value of 10 *l.*?—There are some houses that are not worth 10 *l.*, many that have registered; my impression is they are not worth 10 *l.*

5580. I want to endeavour to arrive at the criterion of value in your mind; what it is that enables you to decide the value of a particular house; suppose I ask you, is the house I point out to you worth 10 *l.* a year, and I tell you it pays but 7 *l.*, do you conclude then it is worth 10 *l.* a year?—If it went so near the rent as 7 *l.*, I should say it was worth 10 *l.* If the man would say it was worth as much as 10 *l.*, I should say it was worth 10 *l.*

5581. Then you would conclude in that case the premises were worth 10 *l.*, although they paid but 7 *l.* rent?—They would be worth it to the person living in them.

5582. Would you consider that a good vote; that it was entitled to vote?—Indeed I should rather say so. I never opposed a man who paid 7 *l.*

5583. You did not?—I did not.

5584. Then whenever the rent was proved to be 7 *l.* a year, you would consider that *prima facie* the man would make out a case to entitle him to vote?—I should say so.

5585. Now let me ask whether Mr. Guthrie did anything more than that in the principle he acted upon?—I think he did; I think he allowed lodgers to register.

5586. But with reference to value, do you think he did anything stronger than that, and that you would have done under similar circumstances, namely, that where you found a man paying 7 *l.* rent you would consider that man had value for 10 *l.*?—If he considered it was worth 10 *l.* to him, I would take his word for it.

5587. Mr. Hamilton.] Did Mr. Guthrie admit many of those whom you objected to?—No doubt he did.

5588. Then I understand you did not object to any who paid a rent of 7 *l.*?—If it went so near the value as 7 *l.*, I say I did not object to them.

5589. And that was because it was your persuasion, from what you knew of the town, that a man who paid 7 *l.* a year rent in all human probability had an interest worth 10 *l.* in the premises; is not that so?—Yes, I would say so.

5590. And therefore you considered it unreasonable and unjust to object to such men, and you did not object accordingly?—Yes, I would say so.

5591. Chairman.] Am I to understand it is the habit of people in Clonmel to let their houses 30 and 40 per cent. under the real value?—I think some landlords do not ask so much as others.

5592. But do you conceive it is the habit of landlords in Clonmel to ask from 30 to 40 per cent. under the real value of their houses?—I do not.

5593. Supposing you state that a party pays 7 *l.* for a house, which you afterwards state to be of the value of 10 *l.*, does not the landlord there lose more than 30 per cent. value?—Some landlords set cheaper than others.

5594. Is not the taking of 7 *l.* for a house, which you state to be of the value of 10 *l.*, losing 3 *l.* value, 3 *l.* in rent?—It is a hard thing to say whether it is worth 10 *l.* where a man paid 7 *l.*

5595. But supposing the value to be 10 *l.* and the man pays 7 *l.*, does not the landlord lose 3 *l.* on the real value of the house?—He of course does.

5596. And have you not stated in a former part of your examination, that it is the habit of parties in Clonmel, on the one hand, to get as much rent as they can, and, on the other hand, to pay as little rent as they can?—Yes, I should imagine it was; persons get houses as cheap as they can.

5597. Do you mean to state that parties holding houses in Clonmel are not able to let their houses which they value at 10 *l.* at more rent than 7 *l.*?—I would not say that.

5598. Do not the proprietors of houses in Clonmel consider what the real value is that they can get for the houses they have to let before they ask the rent?—I think Clonmel is a place where you would have the fullest value for a place that you have to set; I think places are set very high in Clonmel.

5599. The landlords get a full rent for their houses?—I think if they were to look to it they would.

5600. Are the landlords in Clonmel particularly careless of their own interest?—I do not think they are.

5601. Then I should presume they do look for it?—Some do, and some do not.

5602. Then you mean to say there are some who, when they can get 10 *l.* rent for

for their houses, allow their houses to be let for 7*l*.; is that so?—I think houses are set for 7*l*. that may be worth 10*l*.

5603. Why do you say that?—Because I think some persons do not look for as much as others, and it would make a difference with the tenant, whether it was a good or a bad tenant.

5604. Then you think the value of a house depends on whether the tenant is a good or bad tenant?—I think the business he follows ought to be looked at, whether he has a mart for it; his business may be more profitable than another's.

5605. And therefore if a shoemaker goes out of a house of a certain description, and a tailor comes in, would you make any difference then?—No; I dare say you would get the same value from the same class of persons.

5606. If they were common labourers, would that make a difference?—No, I do not think common labourers could well pay.

5607. Then what do you mean to say; that according to the difference of the calling of the party a different rent would be asked or taken?—I do not think a different rent would be asked or taken.

5608. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You mean according to the difference of solvency of the parties?—I think the difference of solvency of the parties would make a difference.

5609. Mr. Lefroy.] Do you think a landlord would require a larger rent from a less solvent man; do you think that is the principle upon which a landlord would let?—I do not think a man would let to a person he did not think was a tolerably good tenant.

5610. When you say a landlord makes a difference according to the solvency of the tenant, do you mean he takes less rent from a more solvent tenant, or that he would exact more rent from a more solvent tenant?—No, I should not think he would exact more rent from a more solvent tenant.

5610*. Do you think he would take less rent from a more solvent tenant?—Yes.

5611. And more rent from a less solvent tenant?—He might ask more rent, and not let him have it if he did not come up to the mark.

5612. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] His rent would be better secured by the more solvent tenant than it would be by the less solvent tenant?—No, it would not be more secure by the less solvent tenant.

5613. Supposing 9*l*. a year were payable by a solvent tenant, it would be better secured to the landlord than 10*l*. a year payable by a less solvent?—Yes.

5614. Do not you account in that way for a landlord being willing to take a lower rent from a more solvent tenant?—I think he would from a more solvent tenant take a less rent.

5615. You were asked with respect to whether it was the practice of landlords in Clonmel to let their premises at 30 or 40 per cent below their value; when you speak of their value, do you mean the value to the tenant or to the landlord?—I should say value to the tenant.

5616. Do you conceive this to be the practice for a landlord, although he wishes to get as much as he can for his premises, and although the tenant wishes to pay as little as he can, for the two to adjust their respective demands in this way, that the tenant in the end, upon striking the bargain, will give something less than the value, and the landlord, on the other hand, will give up something, which would otherwise go into his pocket for the rent?—Yes, I would say that.

5617. So that in that way, in the ordinary course of bargains for a house, it comes to this, that the landlord gets something less than the value, and the tenant also gets a certain interest beyond the rent; is not that it?—Yes, I should think so.

5618. And your impression then is, that, speaking generally, the tenant has an interest in the premises beyond the rent he pays?—Yes; I think he ought to have an interest beyond it.

5619. That he ought to have, and, in point of fact, he has, according to your impression?—Yes, I think he has. I get 70*l*. a year for houses myself in Clonmel.

5620. And what are they worth to the tenant?—I believe the tenant pays me amply; 70*l*. is ample for it.

5621. But still he has some interest beyond that?—He has a cellar under his house.

Mr. *Edw. Lobarte.*

19 April 1837.

5622. Mr. *Lefroy.*] Does that tenant make more than 70*l.* a year?—He pays me 70*l.* Irish a year.
5623. Does he make more than that?—I think it is quite enough for it. He has a very good business; he is a grocer.
5624. *Chairman.*] Does he make more than that of it?—I do not think he does; I do not think he makes more; he has been in the house 24 years, and would not leave it; and I set it for what he paid before.
5625. Mr. *Lefroy.*] Your habit, then, has been to let at a full value, and that your tenant should pay the full value?—I let at what it was let for before I got it; I did not disturb any tenant.
5626. That was the full value?—I thought so.
5627. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] Are you speaking of more than one house, or only one?—I am speaking now of only one.
5628. Then your habit is not to get the full rent?—I recovered the possession of the two houses, taking them as they were. My father made a lease in reversion, and the lease in reversion pays me 35*l.* a year for the rent.
5629. Then when you were asked what was your habit, you did not mean to say it was your habit, except in one instance?—I let each tenant have their place as I found it.
5630. Therefore it is not your habit to claim the full value of the premises from tenants, because from one you get the full value, and the other only half; is not that so?—Yes.
5631. Mr. *Lefroy.*] Have you let any other houses?—I have, to other people.
5632. And when you have let to other people, have you let the houses at an under value?—I let the houses at what the former landlord put on it. I did not let it; I gave a lease.
5633. And did you conceive that to be an under value?—I thought it was worth it.
5634. But was it worth materially more?—No, I do not think it was.
5635. Then in all the cases in which you have acted for others, you have let the houses that you had so to let at a price not materially under the real value?—Yes, I believe so.
5636. That is your practice?—That would be my practice.
5637. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] That is to say, you let it at such price as the tenant was willing to give you?—Yes, he was willing to give it, and the landlord was willing to take it.
5638. And of course, from the answers you have already given, it follows, that the tenants did not give what you call the full value of the premises; they had something beyond the rent that they paid; the tenants had an interest in the premises beyond the rent they paid?—They considered they had.
5639. Seventy pounds a year, you stated?—Irish pounds.
5640. And the tenant is a grocer?—Yes.
5641. And carries on his trade there?—Yes.
5642. And also lets the cellar underneath?—And he lets lodgings at the assize.
5643. And makes profit of the premises accordingly?—Yes.
5644. By his trade, by letting lodgings at the assizes, and by letting the cellar?—Yes.
5645. Now, summing up all his profits together, do you mean to say he does not make more than 70*l.* of it (Irish pounds), a year more than the rent he pays to you?—I will not say whether he does or not; but I think it is a very fair good value for it.
5646. Taking, first of all, the profits of his trade; what do you suppose them to be?—He has a very good trade.
5647. What would you say a man in that line in Clonmel—what street is it in?—In the Main-street, one of the best streets in Clonmel.
5648. And has he a good strong shop?—A large grocer's shop, and his wife has a female business.
5649. What do you call a female business?—Bonnets.
5650. In the same premises?—Yes.
5651. Then there are two trades carried on there?—Yes, she is a mantles-maker.
5652. Then, now just consider what are the profits of his trade as a grocer; what do you suppose he makes in a year?—I should suppose he makes very largely. He has a very good business.

5653. What

5653. What would you call very largely?—I suppose he makes some hundreds a year.
5654. His wife, I presume, makes something by her trade as a dress-maker?—Yes, I dare say she does.
5655. Is her's a good business?—I dare say it is.
5656. Would you be surprised to hear she made 50 *l.* a year?—I am not aware what she makes.
5657. These premises you let for 70 *l.* a year?—Yes.
5658. In addition to that, what rent does he get for the cellar?—£. 6 or 7 *l.* a year.
5659. What does he get for the assizes?—I do not know; Richard Moore is the person who lodges there.
5660. But however, one way or another, have you any doubt, your tenant, who pays you 70 *l.* a year Irish, makes a vast deal more of the premises?—I am sure he does of his business.
5661. *Chairman.*] Would you say he makes 400 *l.* or 500 *l.* a year more than he gives you?—I would not say that; I know he has married some daughters, and married them very well; gave them fortunes.
5662. He makes perhaps 300 *l.* a year, he and his wife together?—No, I should say not that.
5663. Does he make 200 *l.* a year, he and his wife together?—I dare say they do.
5664. Then am I to understand that that house is worth 270 *l.* a year?—Not without the business, I suppose it would not.
5665. Do you mean to tell me that that house is worth all the money he makes in his business, and his wife makes in her business?—It is a very good situation for business; one of the very best in Clonmel.
5666. You say he makes, take the least, 200 *l.* and the rent 70 *l.*, that he makes 270 *l.*; do you mean to say the house is worth to him 270 *l.* a year?—Not without his business it would not.
5667. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Then is his business worth it?—It is; it is not the house that is worth it.
5668. His capital and the business are worth 200 *l.*, and the house is worth 70 *l.*; is that it?—Yes.
5669. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] That is, the house is worth it for carrying on his business?—
5670. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Is it worth more than 70 *l.* for carrying on the business or for any purpose?—I do not suppose he would pay more than 70 *l.*
5671. *Chairman.*] Is there any other man in Clonmel who would give more than 70 *l.* for it?—I did not try any person.
5672. Do you believe if it were vacant to-morrow anybody else in Clonmel would give more than 70 *l.* a year for that house?—I would not ask it; I set it at 21 years' lease, 70 *l.* a year Irish.
5673. Do you believe there is any other person in Clonmel who would give more than 70 *l.* a year for that house?—No, I do not think there is.
5674. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Supposing the tenant were to die or to leave Clonmel, and a person came there and wished to set up in the same line, a grocer's shop, and he wished to take that house for the purpose, there having been already a considerable trade carried on there, do you suppose he would not be willing to give more than a person who might wish to take it for any other business?—I think the house worth 70 *l.* a year for any purpose to another. It is one of the best situations in the town of Clonmel.
5675. Then if it is worth it for any purpose, it is worth more for the purpose of the same trade already carried on there; the goodwill of the trade?—Why, there are grocers at each side of it.
5676. But even so, if there is an extensive trade going on, would you not consider the goodwill of the trade would make the premises more valuable to a person wishing to set up the same trade?—I think a person who sets up within a door or two of it would be as well off.
5677. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Would you say that a grocer living in a house having a shop and making 1,000 *l.* a year by his trade, that he occupied a house worth 1,000 *l.* a year?—No, I would not.

Luce, 24th die Aprilis, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Attorney General for Ireland.	Mr. Serjeant Jackson.
Mr. Serjeant Ball.	Mr. Lefroy.
Sir Robert Ferguson.	Mr. Morgan John O'Connell.
Mr. French.	Mr. Moore O'Ferrall.
Mr. Milnes Gaskell.	Lord Granville Somerset.
Mr. Hamilton.	Mr. E. Tement.
Mr. Hogg.	

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Edward Labarte, called in; and further Examined.

Mr. E. Labarte.

24 April 1837.

5678. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] YOU have the corporation books?—I have.
5679. You have told us you are the town clerk of Clonmel?—Yes.
5680. And have been so since the year 1819, I think?—Since the year 1819.
5681. The Corporation Commissioners were in Clonmel, investigating the affairs of the corporation, in the month of October 1833, were they not?—Yes.
5682. Do you recollect being examined by them?—I do.
5683. You were examined by the Commissioners?—I was.
5684. You were examined as to the manner in which freemen had been made by the corporation, I think?—Yes.
5685. Now you will be so good as to turn to the return which you as town clerk have made to this Committee; the return of the freemen of Clonmel, I think, for five years antecedent to the passing of the Reform Bill?—I did not make a return; I merely took down instructions for myself. I made a return latterly to the Irish Government for the purpose of this Committee.
5686. That is the return that you hold in your hand, is it not?—I believe it is.
5687. Now do you observe, under the head, Right of Admission, that certain persons are returned as having been admitted in right of birth?—Yes, I do.
5688. Others by grace especial?—There were two by grace especial, I think.
5689. Others in right of marriage?—Yes.
5690. And others in right of servitude?—Yes.
5691. Do you observe also, that antecedent to the 11th May 1832, no person appears to have been admitted either in right of birth, marriage, or servitude, on the face of that return?—No; I believe not.
5692. You are well acquainted with the corporation books containing the proceedings of the corporation?—Yes.
5693. You have their books before you?—Yes.
5694. Now, do you happen to know, from reference to the books, whether, antecedent to the passing of the Reform Bill, a single instance can be found upon the books of a freeman admitted to the corporation of Clonmel in right of servitude?—Yes, there is.
5695. In right of servitude?—Yes.
5696. I beg your pardon; in right of marriage?—No, I believe not.
5697. Are you not quite sure there is not?—I believe there is not.
5698. Are you not sure there is not, from examining the books?—I believe there is not.
5699. I do not ask you your belief: is not the fact so; have you not examined the books?—I have.
6000. For what purpose?—I did for that purpose.
6001. And have you not ascertained that no entry appears on the books of an admission of any freeman, in right of marriage, antecedent to the passing of the Reform Bill?—Yes; there is none admitted in that right.
6002. Now I come to two other rights, servitude and birth. I wish to know how

how many years elapsed before the passing of the Irish Reform Bill, which was in 1832; how many years appear by the corporation books to have passed away without any person being admitted either in right of service or birth, as appears in the books?—I believe the book is silent as to what the right of admission was.

6003. Then I am to understand you to say, that no entry appears on the corporation books of any admission in right of servitude or of birth, for any particular period antecedent to the Reform Bill; can you state what the period is?—I was admitted myself in 1819, on my father's death.

6004. What is the entry of your admission?—It is silent as to the admission.

6005. I am not speaking of entries which are silent, but of entries which speak. Do you find any entry of any admission in right either of servitude or of birth, for, say 80 years?—Yes.

6006. What is the first entry you find?—Mr. Bagwell was admitted in 1832.

6007. That is in your return; I am calling your attention to a period anterior to the 11th of May 1832?—It is silent as to what right they were admitted in; there were the two Mr. Kellys, Mr. Creagh, Mr. Croker.

6008. I want to call your attention to any case in which there is any specification of a right; what is the earliest instance which you find of any specification of a right in which the freeman was admitted anterior to the 11th May 1832?—There is no right specified, except in the year 1748, I believe it is.

6009. Then, do I understand you to say, that from the year 1748 to the 11th of May 1832, when Mr. Bagwell was admitted, there is no entry in the corporation books of any freeman admitted in right either of servitude or of birth?—No.

6010. Mr. Hagg.] Will you allow me to ask you, does that document in your hand tell not only the persons admitted, but the right by virtue of which they were admitted?—It does not specify the right in which they were admitted.

6011. Does not specify the right under which each person was admitted?—As to the date of their admission; but it is silent as to what the right of admission is.

6012. I do not ask you as to the dates; I want to know the fact; does that specify the right under which each person is admitted?—No, it does not.

6013. Have you any means of knowing the right, except from looking at that document?—No; this is taken from the corporation books.

6014. Have you any means of knowing the right under which any person was admitted, except by looking at that document?—No, I have no means.

6015. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Therefore your evidence amounts to this: that whereas, from the year 1748 to the 11th May 1832, it appears by the corporation books that several persons were admitted freemen, it does not appear that any one of them were admitted in right either of servitude or of birth; is that your evidence?—Yes; the corporation book is silent as to that.

6016. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Does it appear they were not admitted in that right?—No, it does not.

6017. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then it is silent from the year 1748 to the 11th May 1832, as to the right in which any person was admitted?—It is.

6018. Do you say, that during that interval there is no entry of any person admitted by grace especial?—No; the book does not specify it, except in two instances, which were in 1833.

6019. Now, in 1748, then, I understand you to say, there is an entry of some person or persons admitted in one or other of the rights I have mentioned, viz. servitude or birth?—Yes.

6020. Can you turn to that entry?—I can. [*The witness referred to the book.*]

6021. Have you found the entry in 1748?—No, I have not.

6022. Are you quite sure it is 1748; perhaps it is 1784?—It is page 21 in the book; and there are a number of persons admitted, "served their several apprenticeships in the town;" there were fourteen or fifteen admitted then.

6023. *Chairman.*] State what is the date of that entry?—The 13th June 1748.

6024. What is the earliest date of that book?—The 8th September 1744.

6025. Is that the earliest book connected with the borough of Clonmel of which you have possession?—It is, that I have possession of.

6026. Are you aware whether there is any earlier book than that existing?—I understood there was another book; but it was burnt or destroyed some years ago; may be hundreds ago.

Mr. E. Labarte.

24 April 1837.

6027. By accident, or by purpose was it destroyed?—Accident, I should suppose. It was a prior book to that.

6028. Did you ever see that prior book?—Never.

6029. It was before you came into office?—Before I came into office; I heard it was destroyed some hundred years, perhaps, before.

6030. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now you have an extract from this entry or a copy of it there, have you not?—I have an extract.

6031. Do you observe in the first part of the extract, (or I will examine you out of the book,) do you observe from the first part of this entry, dated the 13th June 1748, it appears that certain persons named, were admitted freemen, being Protestant residents within the town, served their apprenticeship, and being the eldest sons of freemen?—Yes.

6032. Now look a little further and you will find, that certain other persons were admitted on the same day, being Protestant residents of the town, and having served their several apprenticeships therein; is not that the entry?—Yes.

6033. Now that is the last entry you find of any person or persons, admitted in right either of birth or of servitude, anterior to the 11th of May 1832?—Yes, I think it is.

6034. Mr. Lefroy.] Can you take upon yourself to say that those are the last persons that were admitted in right of birth or servitude?—From my own knowledge I know they were not; I know persons were admitted in right of birth, and some claimed in right of service, and were admitted, but it does not specify; the book is silent as to the rights they were admitted in.

6035. There may have been then, between the year 1748, and the time at which you were acquainted with the corporation, numbers admitted in these rights, for aught you know?—There might certainly for what I know.

6036. Then it is simply from the silence of the book that you have given an answer to the former question?—Yes, certainly.

6037. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then, in point of fact, there is no record of the admission of any person as a freeman, in right of servitude or birth, between the year 1748 and the 11th May 1832?—No, the book does not specify it.

6038. There is no record?—No record.

6039. Of any description?—Of any description that I know of.

6040. Mr. Hogg.] When a person is admitted in right of apprenticeship, or birth, or otherwise, does that right appear on the face of the book?—No.

6041. Then no right, be it what it may, appears on the face of that book generally?—No, it does not; there is one instance, Mr. Bagwell was admitted the 11th May 1832.

6042. Then you have no means of knowledge except from looking at that book in your hand?—No.

6043. And that book tells you nothing?—It tells me nothing about it.

6044. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] It tells you nothing from 1748 to the 11th of May 1832?—No, it does not.

6045. But it does tell you something anterior to 1748, and in that year it tells you the rights then?—It does.

6046. Now you have already answered me, I think, that with respect to the third right, namely, marriage, there is no trace whatever of an admission in right of marriage anterior to the 29th March 1833; I think that is the earliest; am I correct in that?—The book is silent as to the right they were admitted in; but this paper having come down from Government, from the Stamp Office, with the stamps for the admissions, it does specify A. B. being married to a daughter of C. D. a freeman.

6047. What is that document?—It is a document that came down from the stamp-office, and I filled it up from that.

6048. It came down, when?—After the Reform Bill passed.

6049. Now this purports to be instructions for filling up blanks in entries of admissions of freemen, to be handed to the different clerks of corporations; this appears to be a form applicable to all corporations, is it not?—I suppose so.

6050. This was subsequent to the Reform Bill: I am now speaking of what occurred anterior to the Reform Bill; and I say, previous to that, anterior to the 29th March 1833, there is no record of any admission in right of marriage in the corporation book?—There is not.

6051. Now are you aware, as you probably must be, that before the Irish Reform Act, which received the royal assent the 7th of August 1832, that by that

that Act the rights of freemen are preserved, such rights as they had anterior to the passing of the Act?—Yes.

6052. With reference to voting?—Yes.

6053. You are aware also that freemen admitted by grace especial, that is honorary freemen, were not to have any right to vote?—No.

6054. Those admitted subsequent to that Act?—No; there were but two admitted by grace especial since the Reform Act.

6055. They were admitted the 29th March 1833, I think?—Yes; they both registered as householders.

6056. They could not register as freemen, because they were admitted by grace especial, after the period specified in the Act?—No.

6057. You are probably aware that the provision of the Reform Act is, that 50 persons admitted honorary freemen since the 30th of March 1831, shall have a right to vote; it has a retrospective operation?—Yes.

6058. Now, accordingly, from the 30th of March 1831, from that period the only persons admitted freemen, who would be entitled to vote, would be persons admitted in some other right, and not admitted as honorary freemen?—Yes.

6059. So that to entitle a man to vote after the 30th March 1831, he must be admitted in some right recognized by the corporation?—Yes.

6060. Then the first admission that appears on the book in right of birth, you told me, as it appears by the return, was the 11th May 1832, that of the present Mr. Bagwell?—Yes.

6061. The patron of the corporation?—Yes.

6062. Well, that was about two or three months before the Reform Bill received the royal assent, and this provision, restricting the right of voting to such honorary freemen as had been made antecedent to the 30th March 1831, I suppose you have no doubt was a provision known at that time?—I should think it was.

6063. Then can you account, from that circumstance, for the admission of Mr. Bagwell in right of birth; a specification of his right of birth, if he was admitted as an honorary freeman, which he could have been just as easily, he could not have voted; but have you any difficulty in accounting for his being admitted in right of birth, supposing that right existed?—It is so put into that book, not by me, but by another person.

6064. Will you show me the entry?

[The witness showed the entry to Mr. Serjeant Ball.]

6065. *Chairman.*] The question is, can you account for the entry of Mr. Bagwell by right of birth in one way or the other?—I cannot account for it.

6066. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] You have told me already that there was no entry of an admission in right of birth from the year 1748 down to that period; do you observe that?—I think there was.

6067. I am calling your attention to the circumstance, that until the 30th March 1831, there was no occasion for any such entry; that is to say, that every person admitted anterior to that period, may have been admitted as an honorary freeman; is not that so?—What is the date of Mr. Bagwell's admission?

6068. The 11th of May 1832?—Here is the entry of Mr. Bagwell's admission.

6069. Now be so good as to look at the entry here and the words "in right of birth"; I think I understood you to say they were not your hand-writing?—No; the whole of that is not my writing.

6070. But the words "in right of birth," are they in your hand-writing?—No.

6071. No part of the entry?—No part of the entry at all is mine.

6072. Whose writing is it?—Mr. Douglas's.

6073. Who is he?—He is land-agent of Mr. Bagwell, and one of the burgesses.

6074. I believe in that character he had nothing to do with the corporation books?—When I used to go to Dublin, I left them at Mr. Douglas's office in case they might be wanted.

6075. And this entry is made by Mr. Douglas?—It is; it is in his hand-writing.

6076. Be so good as to look at the words "in right of birth," and tell me whether, in your judgment, they do not appear to have been written at a different period than the other part of the entry: is not the ink brighter?—I know they were written at the same time, and before they were signed by the council.

6077. But look at the appearance, do not they appear to have been written in brighter ink?—I will not pass an opinion upon it; I do not think it is.

Mr. E. Lohrie.

24 April 1837.

6078. Would you say not?—I think not.
6079. *Chairman.*] Well, when were they written?—They were written at the time they were written.
6080. *Mr. Hogg.*] You said they were written, to your knowledge, at the same time?—They were written previous to its being executed.
6081. *Chairman.*] What is the date of it?—It was written the 11th of May 1832, and completed the 24th June 1832.
6082. *Mr. French.*] How do you know when that was written?—I know it was written before it was handed to me to take it to court with me and complete it.
6083. But you were not in the country when that was written?—No, it was written previous to my coming to town.
6084. A person claiming admission, has he a right to say how he claims admission; under what right he claims admission? For instance, has he a right to claim by birth?—He had a right to claim by birth.
6085. Did Mr. Bagwell claim by birth?—I should imagine he did; he had a right to it as the eldest son of a freeman.
6086. Then, if he had a right by birth, he could not be put in by grace especial?—No.
6087. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Could he not have been admitted by grace especial, although he had a right to claim by birth?—If he had a right to be admitted in right of birth, he would not want to claim in right of grace especial.
6088. But supposing he did not think proper to enforce that right if he had it, could he not be admitted by grace especial?—He could, of course.
6089. *Mr. French.*] He could claim by birth, having a right to be admitted by birth; but could the corporation admit him by grace especial?—I think not.
6090. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Could they say, we will not admit you by birth, we will admit you by grace especial; because if he had a right to claim by birth, he had a right to enforce his claim: is not that so?—I think so.
6091. What evidence have you that he claimed by birth, or claimed in any right at all; is there anything in the book to show it?—No, nothing; it does specify that he was admitted in right of birth.
6092. But there is no memorial, no petition, or document to show he ever put in any claim of any kind?—There were no memorials at that time.
6093. Then there is nothing to show he claimed by birth, except this entry that he was admitted in right of birth?—No.
6094. Now I ask you to account to me for this appearing the first entry of an admission in right of birth, from the year 1748; can you see any reason why Mr. Bagwell should have been admitted in right of birth, and why that should have been entered?—I cannot.
6095. After having called your attention to the Reform Bill and to the provision, do you see no reason?—No, I do not; I cannot express any opinion upon it.
6096. I called your attention to the fact, that unless he was admitted in right of birth, or in some other right excepting grace especial, he could not vote?—No, unless as eldest son.
6097. Now I ask you again, do you see then a reason for his being admitted in right of birth, which reason did not operate until the passing of the Reform Bill?—I see no reason for his having been admitted in right of birth.
6098. Did he not get a vote by it? If he had been admitted by right especial could he have voted?—No, he could not.
6099. Then do not you see a reason for his being admitted in right of birth; did he not get a vote by it?—He did.
6100. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Is not the fact of having the right a sufficient reason for his being admitted in virtue of that right?—I think it is.
- 6100*. *Chairman.*] Where does Mr. Bagwell live?—Within two short miles of Clonmel; he is now on the continent, I believe.
6101. Is his name on the register?—Yes, I believe it is.
6102. Is he within the boundary of the borough?—Within six miles of Clonmel; he would be entitled to register the vote.
6103. But is he within the boundary of the borough?—No, he is not.
6104. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] His residence is within the boundary of the borough, is it not?—Certainly.
6105. Accordingly, he was not resident within the borough at the time when he was admitted a freeman?—He had an office in Clonmel.

6106. But

6106. But he was not a resident?—No.
6107. Mr. Hamilton.] Was his residence then within seven miles?—Yes, within two miles.
6108. And accordingly, if he registered as a householder, he would be entitled to do so under the Reform Bill; but what I want to know is, when he was admitted a freeman, was he resident within the borough?—No.
6109. Now as to any right of admission, either by servitude or by birth, you cannot speak of that from the book, because you find no such right recognized from the year 1748 to the year 1833?—It is not recognized on the book.
6110. Do you know any instance in which not the eldest son, but the second son of a freeman, has been admitted since the Reform Bill, claiming by birth; are there not some instances?—I think not.
6111. Mr. Henry Ryall; do you know him?—The mayor? William Henry Ryall, the mayor of Clonmel?
6112. Is he the second or the eldest son?—The eldest.
6113. Is there not another Mr. Ryall, a freeman?—There is Samuel Ryall, his brother; his second brother.
6114. Was he admitted in right of birth?—He was admitted in right of apprenticeship.
6115. Chairman.] Samuel Ryall, solicitor, is that the gentleman you mean?—Yes.
6116. He is entered in right of service?—Yes.
6117. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Is he the second son?—Yes.
6118. You know him to be?—I do.
6119. And the eldest is William Henry Ryall?—Yes.
6120. Do you know Mr. Richard Moore, the barrister, to have been admitted a freeman?—He has been admitted a great many years; twenty years and upwards.
6121. Then cannot you say in what right he was admitted, because it does not appear by the book; but, however, he was the second son of his father?—Yes, the second or the third son; but there is another Richard Moore, admitted in right of being the eldest son of a freeman.
6122. When was he admitted?—He was admitted, I think, in 1832 or 1833.
6123. Was his father's name Stephen?—No, I think not.
6124. Who was his father?—Richard Moore, I believe, also.
6125. Richard Moore, of Summer Hill, esq.?—Yes.
6126. What Richard Moore is that?—He is his cousin.
6127. Was not his father's name Stephen?—No, Richard.
6128. Now, there is Joseph Going; do you know him?—I do.
6129. When was he admitted; Joseph Going, Clonmel, gentleman?—24th June 1836, in right of birth.
6130. Do you know he was the second son of Stephen Going?—I have heard it since, that he was the second son; his elder brother having died.
6131. Then, in point of fact, I will give one instance in which a person has been admitted so late as the 24th June 1836 as a freeman in right of birth, he being the second son, and not the eldest?—He was the second son; but he is the eldest son, and has been for years.
6132. And still a second son has been admitted the 24th June 1836, claiming in right of birth?—He was, certainly; and he sought to be registered, but the barrister refused to register him.
6133. Has he not been registered since?—No.
6134. What barrister refused him?—Mr. Howley refused him at the last registry, to my knowledge.
6135. Turn to the admissions between 1819 and 1832, the first on your return.—[The witness did so.]
6136. I believe there were only seven?—There were but a few.
6137. Have you got it; between 1819 and 1832, were there some persons admitted?—Yes.
6138. Could you mention how many of those were not resident within the borough; will you mention the names?—I was first admitted myself in 1819; I am resident. Arthur G. Craigh was not; John Keily, jun., esq., was not; Richard Keily, esq., was not; Benjamin Craigh of Lorantine was not; Charles Croker was not; the Rev. Thomas Croker was not; Mr. Bagwell is the next.

Mr. E. Laborte.

24 April 1837.

6139. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Did those persons register whose names you gave?—They did not; Mr. Bagwell is registered.

6140. *Chairman*.] They are not registered as electors for the town of Clonmel?—No.

6141. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Do you mean none of them?—No.

6142. You are a resident?—I am registered as a freeman.

6143. Are there any others except Mr. Bagwell registered as freemen?—No.

6144. You are sure of that?—I am sure of it.

6145. Is Mr. Bond Lowe a freeman?—No; there is no Mr. Bond Lowe, a freeman. Mr. Richard Butler Hamilton Lowe is a freeman.

6146. When was he admitted; do you recollect?—A great number of years ago; I suppose thirty years ago.

6147. In point of fact, he was not resident?—He was within the limits specified by the Reform Act.

6148. That is, within seven miles; but he was not within the borough?—No.

6149. He is registered?—He is.

6150. And I believe he voted?—And voted; yes, he is within four miles, I believe, of Clonmel.

6151-52. So that, assuming that he was regularly admitted a freeman, of course he would not be entitled to vote under the Reform Act? I want to get the fact, whether he was a resident or not within the borough at the time of his admission; you tell me he was not?—

Chairman.] Was he, or was he not, resident within the borough at the time of his admission?—

Witness.] I should think not; he never lived in Clonmel.

6153. Mr. *Lefroy*.] Was he a resident at the time he registered?—At the time he registered, he was.

6154. *Chairman*.] But the admissions we are talking of; was he at the time of his admission?—I should think not.

6155. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Do you know his residence is within four miles of Clonmel?—Yes.

6156. And you know that residence is not within the limits of the borough?—No, it is not.

6157. Now be so good as to tell me, whether you know of any other instances of freemen who have registered who were not resident within the borough at the time when they were admitted freemen?—Yes; Richard Butler Hamilton Lowe, esq., of Lowe's Green.

6158. What is the date?—The 24th of June 1795.

Mr. *Michael Glisson*, called in; and further Examined.

Mr. M. Glisson.

6159. *Chairman*.] HAVE you the two books that you were desired at your last examination to correct, the one by the other?—I have.

6160. Have you corrected the book which was put into your hands, purporting to be the registry of the borough of Clonmel, by the clerk of the peace's book?—I have.

6161. Have you further corrected it, by your own knowledge, as to who has died, or removed from the registry?—I have.

6162. Now will you hand that in?—[*The same was handed in.*]

6163. Have you put any letters opposite the different parties whose names have been changed?—I have.

6164. Have you placed any particular mark opposite those who have died?—I have.

6165. What is that mark?—The letter D.

6166. And opposite those who have removed?—The letter R.

6167. Those are all the marks you have made?—That is all.

6168. And those marks are correctly put, are they?—They are, to the best of my knowledge.

6169. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] In point of fact, have you counted the number of persons whom you marked as dead or removed?—I have.

6170. How many are they?—299.

6171. What is the entire number on the registry?—866.

6172. What is the remainder?—The remainder is 567.

6173. Do you state that 567 is the entire number now appearing on the registry, deducting the deaths and removals?—567 is the number now on the registry;

registry; out of which there are 16 that are registered both as householders and freemen.

6174. Deduct the 16 from the 567, and what will be the amount?—551.
 6175. Then 551 is the actual number, and not the apparent number now on the registry?—Just so.
 6176. Does this return include the last registry in January?—No.
 6177. How many registered in January?—I do not know that any registered in January; in April there were some registered.
 6178. Then, when I asked you how many registered in January, I ought to have asked you how many registered in April?—In April; yes.
 6179. It does not include the last registry in April?—No.
 6180. But it does include all the antecedent registries to April?—Yes.
 6181. How many registered in April?—Nineteen; the 28th of March it was.
 6182. Then, if you add the 19 that registered on the 28th of March, how many will that make?—570.

Mr. E. Labarte, called in; and further Examined.

6183. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] NOW specify any others who were admitted freemen and not resident within the borough besides Mr. Hamilton Lowe?—At the time they were admitted?
 6184. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Yes?—Arthur G. Craigh.
 6185. Was he resident in the borough?—Yes.
 6186. But will you be so good as specify any person that is registered, and who was non-resident at the time when he was admitted a freeman, besides Mr. Hamilton Lowe?—Charles Ryall was admitted when he was a resident out of town.
 6187. And he, you state, was non-resident when he was admitted a freeman?—He was; he was not living in the town; he had the Bank of Clonmel, but he was not resident.
 6188. His residence was without the town?—Yes.
 6189. Mr. Lefroy.] Did he ever sleep at the banking-house?—Not that I know of; not at the banking-house; he did not, his brother did.
 6190. Mr. Morgan John O'Connell.] At what time was he admitted a freeman?—He was admitted the 8th Dec. 1800.
 6191. Mr. Lefroy.] Did the charter of Clonmel require residence as a qualification to admission to the corporation?—No.
 6192. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Are you clear upon that?—It is silent about it; it does not say.
 6193. Which charter do you allude to, the charter of James I.?—James I., I think.
 6194. Mr. Lefroy.] Was it ever, in fact, deemed necessary to the qualification?—No.
 6195. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Within your experience?—Within my experience it was not.
 6196. And that is since 1819?—Yes.
 6197. Mr. Lefroy.] Or from anything you could trace in the books?—Or from anything I could trace in the books.
 6198. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now let me call your attention to what is in the book on that subject. You have the bye-laws, I think, in the corporation books, have you not?—I have, in the old one.
 6199. You probably recollect the bye-law, called "Morgan's Bye-Law"?—Yes.
 6200. Chairmen.] What is the date of that?—1748. Here is what I have taken down out of it: "19th April 1748, Jeremy Morgan, when mayor, entered several bye-laws on the books."
 6201. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] What is that you are reading from?—An extract from that book; page 17 in that book (the old corporation book).
 6202. I will first call your attention to the entry that you have already referred to, the entry of certain admissions in the same year, 1748; and that entry specifies that they were resident within the borough. Do you find that it is the 13th June 1748, certain persons are admitted as freemen?—It is in the book.
 6203. Now, confining yourself to that, can you say nothing appears on the book to warrant you in saying that residence within the town was deemed requisite to entitle parties to their freedom?—We considered that they had not a right to demand it by right, unless they were resident in the town.
 6204. Then, when you answered the Honourable Member just now, that you

Mr. Gillera.

24 April 1837.

Mr. E. Labarte.

Mr. E. Lister.

24 April 1837.

were not aware, from any thing in the book, it was necessary to entitle a man to his freedom that he should be resident in the town, I presume that entry did not occur to you?—No.

6205. It did not occur to you that this entry was in the book in the year 1742?—I thought it was 1744.

6206. Even, if it were 1744, am I not correct in saying it does appear from the book, from this entry I just read to you, that residence within the borough was deemed a requisite to entitle the party to be admitted to his freedom?—It appears by that entry they were residents; those that were admitted.

6207. Is it not specified in both instances that they were residents within the town?—It is.

6208. Now, have you got a copy of the charter?—I have got a copy for myself of the charter of the 6th of James I.

6209. Is it not part of the muniments of the corporation?—No.

6210. It is not?—It is not. I got a copy out of the records in Dublin myself, which cost me 5 l., I believe.

6211. Mr. *Morgan John O'Connell*.] You have read the charter?—I have read part of it. I thought I had it with me, until I found in London I had not. I left it with the mayor; he borrowed it from me.

6212. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Now I rather think your recollection of the charter is not quite accurate. Do you recollect the charter is to this effect, that the corporation shall be created and made of the dwellers or inhabitants of the borough; and after making the mayor, bailiffs, and free burgesses the common council, constitutes all other "freemen commonant, or about to be commonant, of or within the said town or borough as the commonalty." I am reading that as the words of the charter of James I., to which I refer; is it your recollection that those words are not in the charter?—I cannot say whether they are or are not.

6213. You cannot say then, according to your recollection, that the freemen are not limited, or rather the charter does not require that the freemen shall be resident within the borough?—I do not think the charter says anything about it, that they shall be resident within the town to be freemen.

6214. Then the words I read, viz. "who shall be commonant, or about to be commonant" in the borough, are in the charter; you do not think those words are in it?—They may be in it; I do not know whether they are or are not.

6215. If they are in, have you any doubt, that before the time of the charter the freemen must be resident, if those words are in it?—If those words are in it they ought to be resident.

6216. And you cannot take on yourself to say, according to your recollection, whether those words are in it or not?—I do not recollect them.

6217. But supposing, in addition to those words, the following should be in it, that the corporation should be created and made of the dwellers and inhabitants of the borough; the corporation shall consist of dwellers and inhabitants of the borough; if you find those words in it, would you have any doubt that that meant that the freemen, being part of the corporation, should be resident?—Why the Reform Act specifies what distance they shall be resident from the town to have a vote.

6218. Put that entirely out of your head, if you please; I am speaking of the right of admission of freemen, and nothing else; I am asking you whether, if those words were in the charter, you can have any doubt that the freemen must be resident; to entitle them to be freemen they must be resident?—They have not been resident, that I can tell you.

6219. But I am asking you whether those words occur in the charter; then I am putting it, if those words occur in it, have you any doubt that it is necessary, to entitle a man to be a freeman, that he should be a resident within the borough?—I think if those words are in it he should be.

6220. Now you knew the late Mr. Chaytor?—Yes.

6221. He was the mayor of the town?—He was.

6222. He was an old freeman, and I believe he had been mayor of the borough for a considerable time?—He had.

6223. Was he examined before the commissioners?—He was.

6224. At the same time you were?—Yes.

6225. You heard him give his evidence?—I did.

6226. He

6226. He was a very old man at the time, and had been resident, I believe, within the borough some time?—I suppose he was near sixty.
6227. And he had been always a resident within the town?—I believe he was.
6228. And he had been mayor for thirty years, or some such period?—No; I dare say he was fifteen or sixteen years.
6229. Now, did you hear him state his impression as to the rights in which freemen were entitled to be admitted; did you hear him state,——oh! he is dead?—He is dead.
6230. Did you hear him state before the commissioners, that he had never known a right in the freemen claimed in respect of marriage?—I will not say I did or did not; I could not say; I could not answer the question.
6231. You cannot recollect whether you heard him state that or not?—No, I cannot; it is a long time since.
6232. It was in 1833; you know it is four years ago now. Then you do not retain any distinct recollection of what his evidence was, do you?—Indeed I do not.
6233. Did you hear him state that he had never administered a freeman's oath, although he had been mayor for so many years?—No, I did not.
6234. Do you know that, in point of fact, it was not the practice to administer the freeman's oath?—I believe it was the practice.
6235. Do you find any record in the corporation books?—I do not.
6236. When you say it was the practice, from what period do you consider it was the practice?—I know it was administered to myself.
6237. That was in 1819; but was it not on the occasion when you became town-clerk administered?—It was.
6238. Do you know of its being administered to any other person who was admitted a freeman that year, if there was any?—There was nobody admitted but me that year.
6239. Do you know of your own knowledge, that the freeman's oath was administered to any person?—I administered it myself to them.
6240. But antecedent to 1819, when you became town-clerk?—No.
6241. Then you do not know that the freeman's oath was ever administered to any persons when they became freemen, antecedent to 1819?—I know it was; I know my father administered it to all those who had their freedom; he administered it as town-clerk.
6242. Now, do you know that?—I know it was the custom to do it.
6243. That is, you heard so?—And I dare say I might have seen it.
6244. You heard it was the custom; that it was his duty to have done so?—It was, and I am sure he did it.
6245. You have a general impression that he did his duty?—Yes.
6246. But otherwise you do not know, of your own knowledge, that he ever administered that oath, is not that so; there is no record in the corporation books?—No, I believe there is not.
6247. Now you have stated it was your duty, as town-clerk, to administer the oath?—Yes.
6248. Is it not the practice to administer it in the presence of the mayor?—Always.
6249. Now will you undertake to say, from your recollection, whether it was not part of Mr. Chaytor's evidence, the mayor, that for the fifteen or sixteen years that he had acted as mayor, he never had, in a single instance, administered the freeman's oath to any one?—I do not recollect his saying so; I know I administered it to five or six that were admitted then, myself.
6250. To what five or six?—After my own admission.
6251. Was Mr. Chaytor, the mayor, present?—I am sure he was; my impression is, he was present; he must have been present before I would administer it.
6252. Will you state positively, now, he was present?—I do in them instances say he was present; he must have been present.
6253. You state that?—I do, I am sure so; I would not administer it without his being present.
6254. And therefore you state he was present?—I do.
6255. Then, of course, you cannot recollect Mr. Chaytor to have said this in answer to a question: "Mr. Chaytor has been mayor and deputy mayor for the

Mr. E. Labarte.

24 April 1837.

long period of fifteen years, and during that period he has not administered the oath till after the election. I spoke of the election in 1832; that was the question; you do not recollect him to have answered, "I do not ever recollect having administered the oath before December last?"—I do not.

6256. Do you recollect this to have occurred, that you then presented yourself and told Mr. Chaytor, that he, Mr. Chaytor, had sworn you in as a freeman, and that it was then answered, "Yes; when you were sworn in as town-clerk." You then stated (I am asking you if you recollect this), "Not at all, it was when I was sworn in as a freeman;" and Mr. Chaytor says, "It seems I do not recollect the matter." Mr. Labarte says, he was sworn in as a freeman, do you recollect that?—I suppose it did occur; I recollect that passing in court.

6257. Then you do recollect that; then you recollect Mr. Chaytor to have answered as I have stated to you, viz., that for fifteen years he never recollects having administered the oath before December last, that is December 1832?—He was present when I administered it for him as town-clerk to those persons I spoke of.

6258. Did you state that upon this inquiry?—I think I did; and I even put the dates that they were administered to them.

6259. You mentioned your own case; but did you state what you have now mentioned?—I have mentioned the young Mr. Killy's also, they were sworn previous to being elected burgesses.

6260. But you say you have a general impression; you must have recollects it, but you do not otherwise remember?—I do think I mentioned it.

6261. But do you think you mentioned the other fact, namely, that if Mr. Chaytor did not administer the oath himself, you did in his presence?—I was the person who always did it in his presence.

6262. But did you state that, upon that occasion, you had administered it in his presence, although he himself did not administer it?—Something occurred about it; I recollect perfectly well, I did administer those oaths to those persons; they could not have been sworn into the office they were, if it had not been administered.

6263. This is all your general impression; but I am asking you whether you stated that upon this particular occasion; your recollection of the facts, of course, was more fresh than it is now, four years ago; can you say?—I know I corrected Mr. Chaytor in saying I think he did not administer it; I told him I did, and I turned to a book and showed him the date of it.

6264. When you say Mr. Chaytor was sixty years of age, do not you think he was more?—He was between fifty and sixty.

6265. Do you recollect him to have stated he was for fifty years a member of the corporation?—No, I do not; I do not think he was a member of the corporation fifty years.

6266. Then you do not recollect you heard him state that?—No, I do not; I can turn to the date of his admission.

6267. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do so.—It was the 29th September 1801, that he was admitted a freeman.

6268. Then he had been only thirty-two years a freeman; it so appears by that; does it not?—Yes.

6269. Do you recollect him to have stated, with reference to another matter, when he was asked with respect to the necessity of residence to qualify a claimant to his freedom, do you recollect him to have stated that he knew of an application on the ground of birth being made about four years ago; the claim was rejected as the party was non-resident; his name was James Thomson?—I remember it.

6270. You do remember his stating that?—I do remember his stating it.

6271. Do you know yourself any thing of that circumstance?—I was by when he was refused.

6272. As he was non-resident?—Yes.

6273. And he was refused accordingly?—He was; I remember he was refused admission as a freeman.

6274. And Mr. Chaytor stated, in your presence, the claim was rejected, as the party was non-resident; his name was James Thomson?—Yes.

6275. Now with respect to the claim in right of servitude, you are aware that the servitude, the apprenticeship, must be to a freeman?—Yes.

6276. And did you hear Mr. Chaytor state, that that was the practice in his experience?

experience also; that it was considered the practice of the corporation?—I believe it was; he did state that, I believe.

6277. Now do you happen to know of admissions of persons in right of servitude, who did not serve their apprenticeship to freemen, one or more?—I do not.

6278. Now you have been speaking of the charter; do you find any thing in the charter recognizing the rights of freemen by especial favour or any rights?—No.

6279. Then of course you do not find any thing there; or do you find any thing in any of the proceedings of the corporation to that effect?—No, I do not.

6280. Now you do not then find any thing there recognizing the right of the eldest son of an honorary freeman to his freedom as such?—No.

6281. Now do you consider the eldest son of an honorary freeman, since the passing of the Reform Bill, is entitled to his freedom; I will first call your attention to the case of Rhodes and Bridges?—Yes, Bridges has been admitted; the eldest son of Bridges.

6282. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Is he registered?—I believe he is.

6283. *Chairman*.] What is his christian name?—His father's name is Richard, and I am not sure that his is not Richard also.

6284. What is he?—He is a young man serving his time to a surgeon.

6285. I find a Richard Bridges, a surgeon, entered as a householder?—That is the father.

6286. I find a William Bridges, gentleman, entered as a freeman 7th April 1835; is that the person you are talking of?—Yes, that is the son.

6287. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Now was he the eldest son?—He was the only son.

6288. And he was admitted as a freeman in right of birth, as the eldest son of an honorary freeman, admitted since the Reform Act?—Yes.

6289. You are aware that the right of an honorary freeman, admitted since the Reform Act to vote, is taken away by the Act; you have mentioned that already; you are aware of that fact?—Yes.

6290. Then do you conceive that what an honorary member himself cannot do, that a right which he cannot exercise is to be derived through him by his son, and that the son of an honorary freeman has a right to vote since the passing of the Reform Act, although the freeman has not; do you think that likely?—Perhaps it was wrong.

6291. Do you know any other instance of that?—I do not think I do; I believe it is the only instance; it is spoken of as the only instance.

6292. Do you know when the son was admitted a freeman?—The 30th March 1835.

6293. The father was admitted the 29th March 1833, so that just two years intervened. Now I have been hitherto asking you about sons of honorary freemen admitted since the passing of the Reform Bill, and you mentioned the case of William Bridges; do you know cases of persons who have been admitted freemen in right of birth since the Reform Bill, who were in point of fact the sons of honorary freemen admitted before?—Perhaps it might be so; but they could not be honorary freemen before the Reform Bill.

6294. Do you mean to say there were no honorary freemen before the Reform Bill?—There might have been.

6295. But in point of fact, were there not?—For the most part they claimed by right, and would not take it in any other way.

6296. How do you know that?—I know some told me they would not take it otherwise.

6297. But I am speaking before the Reform Bill?—So am I.

6298. You have already told us there is no entry in the book to show in what right they claimed, or in what right they were admitted?—There is no right specified in the book.

6299. I want to know what there is to show they were not all honorary freemen; is there anything to show it?—No.

6300. Then for anything that appears from the records of the corporation, every person admitted a freeman, from the year 1748 to the 11th of May 1832, may have been admitted as an honorary freeman, for anything that appears from the records?—For anything that appears from the records it may be so; but I believe it is not so.

Mr. E. Labate.

24 April 1837.

6301. That is your impression; however, there is no record to show that;—There is no record to show it.
6302. And you have already told me it was not the practice to present any memorial before the year 1832?—I did not see any, but I have them all now since the Reform Bill.
6303. Did you not give me an answer some time ago that it was not the practice to present memorials previous to the passing of the Reform Bill?—I believe not.
6304. So that at this time it is impossible to say, from any record of the corporation, or from any document you know of, that the persons, or any of them who were admitted freemen from the year 1748 to the year 1832, claimed in any right whatever; is it not so?—I cannot tell you whether there was or not.
6305. There is nothing to show it?—There is nothing to show it.
6306. Does it not occur to you that the circumstance of its not being the practice, as far as you know or ever heard of, to send in any memorial previous to the year 1832; does it not occur to you that that of itself affords a ground for presuming that the claimant, or the person who was admitted rather, was admitted by especial favour. If they were admitted on any right, was it not natural they would send in memorials?—It was not the habit to send in memorials.
6307. If they were admitted on any claim of right, would it not have been the natural course to have sent in a memorial stating that; would it not?—It might be the case; they would perhaps have a right to have done it, but it was not demanded from them.
6308. Would it not be the natural course?—It would; I know persons that did send them that were refused; for instance, Hackett, he did demand and was refused.
6309. What time was that?—Six or seven or eight years before; I suppose it was before the Reform Bill was thought of.
6310. But at least in that instance, Mr. Hackett, the gentleman named; but I think there are some others?—There was Mr. Keily.
6311. They sent in memorials?—They presented them, and they were said to be received; they said they would be considered against the next court, and they were refused.
6312. They claimed of right?—They did; which right was not admitted.
6313. They claimed of right, and they sent in memorials?—Yes.
6314. Now the other persons, those you have been speaking of, who appear by the books to have been admitted as far as you know anything of it, did not send in memorials?—No.
6315. And your impression is, it was not the practice to do so; is it not so?—Yes.
6316. So that you have the two facts, namely, that persons whom you know claimed their freedom as of right sent in memorials, and those persons got their freedom?—They were presented in the court.
6317. They were sent in, and they got an answer afterwards, they could not be received?—They were not received at all; they said they would be considered against the next court, and they were refused.
6318. The result is this, then, that for anything you can state from the book or any document in existence, there was not a single freeman admitted, from the year 1748 till the year 1832, who may not have been admitted merely as an honorary member?—It may be so.
6319. Now, do not you happen to know that since the year 1832 several persons have been admitted in right of birth, claiming as being the sons of freemen?—Yes.
6320. Now, if the fact were that those freemen, in right of whom the sons (the claimants) put in their claims as sons; if the fact were that those freemen were honorary freemen, would not the persons I have been speaking of have claimed their freedom as the sons of honorary freemen?—They would.
6321. And for anything you can tell from the corporation book that is the fact, is it not?—It might be so.
6322. For instance, to make the thing clear, the first-named person, John Bagwell, he claimed in right of birth?—Yes.
6323. And his father was admitted as an honorary freeman; of course the present Mr. John Bagwell would have got his freedom as the son of an honorary freeman?—He would.
6324. And

6324. I believe the gentlemen you alluded to, Mr. Hackett and the others, are respectable gentlemen in trade in the town of Clonmel?—They are; Mr. Hackett has a newspaper in the town; he is the editor and proprietor of the newspaper.

6325. And also a bookseller?—Yes.

6326. Mr. Hamilton.] What is the name of the newspaper?—The Tipperary Free Press.

6327. Mr. Serjeant Bell.] Mr. Keily, I believe, is a gentleman in trade; is he not?—He is a soap-boiler.

6328. Do you recollect any others who claimed their freedom in that way?—I think Mr. Keily did, and Mr. Fell.

6329. What was he?—He was a soap-boiler; he is retired from business now.

6330. Do you remember any others?—That Mr. Thomson you spoke of was likewise refused his freedom.

6331. Some of them are persons in trade in the town, and they have been refused their freedom?—They were refused it.

6332. I believe I may say generally, that there are several respectable persons in trade in the town of Clonmel who have not been admitted to their freedom; a good many?—There are some; not a good many, I think.

6333. Pray, you know the fact, are there not a great many Catholic tradesmen in Clonmel?—There are some Catholics.

6334. A good many?—There are more than Protestants.

6335. And I believe I may say there are some very respectable Catholic tradesmen?—There are.

6336. Now, is there a single one of those admitted to his freedom with the exception of one John Farrell?—He was considered entitled to it.

6337. But with the exception of John Farrell?—He was the eldest son of a freeman.

6338. John Farrell is a Catholic?—Yes.

6339. And I believe you have already told me he was the son to an under-agent of Mr. Bagwell?—He was son to a person who had been in Mr. Bagwell's employment.

6340. As under-agent?—I do not know.

6341. He, I believe, is the only Roman Catholic admitted to his freedom?—I believe so.

6342. And his father being then in the employment of Mr. Bagwell, he was admitted a freeman when he was in his employment; was he not?—Yes.

6343. Now, is it not the fact that, generally speaking, from the year 1748 the persons admitted to their freedom were connexions of the Bagwell family; you are aware it is matter of history that there was a transfer of the borough from the Mountcashel family to the Bagwell family?—Yes.

6344. They were the old proprietors of the borough?—They were.

6345. And they sold it to the Bagwell family?—I believe so.

6346. Now, from the period when the Bagwell family became the proprietors, on reference to the books, I think you will find that the persons admitted from time to time to their freedom have been, generally speaking, persons in the employment, or connexions, or relations of the Bagwell family; is it not so? Were not both the Keilys relations of Mr. Bagwell?—They were relations of Mr. Bagwell.

6347. And I rather think every one of those persons you read as admitted were relations of the Bagwell family?—They are, I believe.

6348. Now, does not it occur to you as likely, that Mr. Bagwell, being the patron of the borough, and having the power, as you are aware he had, of nominating freemen; I mean procuring them to be made freemen; you are aware he had that power?—I think he had.

6349. Then, does it not occur to you as likely, that when he procured his own relations to be made freemen, and his own dependants, that he had them made freemen by especial favour; is not that likely?—I think so; those were made during his minority.

6350. I am not speaking of the present Mr. Bagwell, but the head of the Bagwell family for the time being, after they became proprietors of the borough; is it not likely that the persons who were made after the Bagwell family became proprietors of the borough, were admitted by especial favour?—I think they were; they were all respectable persons that he made.

6351. And, generally speaking, relations of persons in the employment, or in some

Mr. F. Lubric.

24 April 1837.

some way connected with the Bagwell family; is it not so?—I will not say relations; for the most part they were not.

6352. The Messrs. Keily?—They were relations.

6353. And Mr. Craigh?—He is a relation.

6354. I think you will find some others?—I will find some relations of his here; there were a great many made.

6355. You know Mr. David Malcomson; do you recollect he was examined before the commissioners?—I think he was.

6356. Were you present when he gave his evidence?—I dare say I was in court.

6357. He was the agent of the Bagwell family at one time, was he not?—I believe he was.

6358. Now, do you recollect his stating that he had claimed his freedom in right of marriage many years before, and he was refused?—I believe there was something of that sort stated.

6359. And do you remember his stating also, that at a subsequent period, in the year 1801, he was admitted a freeman in Mr. Bagwell's time by especial favour? Turn to your return and you will find he was admitted in 1801.—I know he was.

6360. That was after the transfer of the borough from the Mountcashel family?—It was.

6361. You do not recollect the period of the transfer of the borough, do you; about the time?—I think I can tell you; the transfer was about the 31st Dec. 1800. John Bagwell, I see, was made a freeman that year.

6362. Then in the following year, in the year 1801, Mr. Malcomson, who, I believe you are aware, was the agent of the Bagwell family, he was admitted to his freedom; is it not so?—Yes; he was admitted to his freedom.

6363. And you recollect he stated at the same time, that he gave evidence of his having claimed in right of marriage, and having been refused in Lord Mountcashel's time; he stated he was afterwards, as soon as the transfer was completed, namely, in 1801, admitted by especial favour?—Yes.

6364. Now we will go to another subject. With respect to the stamps on the admission of freemen, your practice I believe has been, at least since the passing of the Reform Bill, to have the cockets stamped; is not that so?—They came down from the Stamp Office in this way, stamped with a 1 l. stamp.

6365. This is what you call a cocket?—Yes.

6366. Which I believe I may describe as a copy of the entry in the corporation books of the freemen; is it not so?—Yes.

6367. And you sign it?—Yes; the mayor signs it, and I countersign it.

6368. Your practice since the Reform Bill has been to require these cockets to be stamped?—Yes; they were sent down by the Stamp Office.

6369. Before the Reform Bill was it the practice to sign cockets at all?—No.

6370. Then, of course, there were no cockets stamped; if there were no cockets in existence, there were none stamped?—They were written out in my father's time, for instance.

6371. I am speaking of your time; in your time, antecedent to the Reform Bill; I ask you whether it was your practice to sign cockets at all?—I do not believe I ever did.

6372. Then of course, if you did not sign any cockets, you did not sign any cockets that were stamped?—No.

6373. And there were no cockets stamped; is not that so?—There were stamps purchased at the Stamp Office, and filled up and engrossed.

6374. You never signed any?—No.

6375. Now, when you state stamps were bought at the Stamp Office, and filled up and engrossed, do you mean to state, of your own knowledge, you are aware that that was done in every instance?—In my father's time it was.

6376. But I am calling your attention to your own time?—I engrossed some of them for my father.

6377. I wish to confine your attention to your own time; and I ask you whether you can state that in your time, that is to say from 1819 to 1832, (the passing of the Reform Bill,) in every instance in which a freeman was admitted, he purchased a stamp and filled up the paper?—No, he did not.

6378-79. Mr. *Lefroy*.] In any instance?—

Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] In your own time?—

Witness.] I do not believe he did.

6380. Then

6380. Then of course we have this ascertained, that from 1819 to 1832, that is to say, for 13 years—There were but seven admitted the whole time.
6381. From 1819 to 1832, there were seven admitted during the 13 years, and in no one instance was there a stamp taken out upon the admission of any one of those persons; is not that the fact?—I believe not.
6382. You can also state, I believe, from the corporation books before you, that the entries of admission in the corporation books were never stamped; is not that so?—The admissions were engrossed, I tell you, in my father's time.
6383. But in your own time?—In my own time they were not; there were only five or six or seven instances at most.
6384. So that, in point of fact, in your time the stamp duty never was paid in any form on any entry of the admission of a freeman; is not that so?—Not that I know of.
6385. Now in your father's time; first of all, how long was your father town-clerk; you succeeded him in 1819?—I did.
6386. Very well, how long was he town-clerk?—My father was admitted town-clerk the 24th June 1808.
6387. And you were his immediate successor?—Yes.
6388. Then he must have been eleven years?—He was from the 24th June 1808 to the 20th January 1819, when he died.
6389. Do you happen to know how many freemen were admitted during that time?—About forty-five, I believe.
6390. Now, do you mean to say, or do I understand you intend to say, that the forty-five who were admitted in your father's time paid the stamp duty on their cockets, every one of those forty-five?—I should imagine they did; I know many of them had them to produce before the registering barrister.
6391. Do you mean to state, the persons who so produced cockets before the registering barrister, and who had been admitted freemen in your father's time, paid the stamp duty at the time of their admission?—I do believe they did.
6392. Can you recollect by whom the cockets which they so produced were signed?—They were signed by the town-clerk and the mayor.
6393. At what period you have no memorandum there, have you, of it?—No; but I can tell you about the time; in 1812 there were a number admitted.
6394. That is not the question. I am speaking now about the signatures to the cockets that you say were produced before the registering barrister by freemen admitted during your father's time, that is to say, from 1812 to 1819; do you take on yourself to state from recollection; first of all, did you read those cockets when produced before the registering barrister; did you look at them?—I did.
6395. Did you read them?—I read some of them.
6396. Will you undertake to say in every instance those cockets were countersigned by your father and signed by the then mayor, Mr. Chaytor?—No, he was not the mayor at that time.
6397. Well, whoever was the mayor?—Yes, I believe they were.
6398. You state that?—I do.
6399. In other words, do you state that in no instance were the cockets, which were produced to the registering barrister, signed by the mayor; the late mayor, Mr. Bradshaw; he was the mayor I believe at the time when they were produced to the registering barrister, was he not?—No.
6400. Who was the mayor?—I dare say Mr. Howley previous to Mr. Chaytor.
6401. I want to know whether you will undertake to say, that in no instance was there a cocket produced to the registering barrister, either Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Howley, or Mr. Hobson, signed by the mayor at the time when it was produced and countersigned by you, although the freeman that produced it had been admitted many years before; do you understand the question?—Not exactly.
6402. This will make it more clear, perhaps; you were the town-clerk, and it was your duty to countersign the cockets?—Yes.
6403. Can you state that you have never countersigned any cocket of the admission of a freeman who had been admitted before you became town-clerk?—No, I did not.
6404. You are quite clear of that?—Quite clear.
6405. So that your statement is this, that in every instance in which a freeman was admitted before you became town-clerk, came forward to register and produced a cocket, that cocket had been countersigned by your predecessor and

Mr. E. Loherts.

24 April 1837.

never by you?—I never signed one but I believe for a Mr. Morton, who had not taken his out; there was only one instance.

6406. What was his name?—Mr. Thomas Morton; he did not take out his admission when he was admitted, and when he came to be sworn to be registered he did take it out; I took it out for him.

6407. When was he admitted in point of fact?—In 1812, I believe.

6408. Then in that instance you recollect that you countersigned Mr. Morton's cocket; is not that so?—I believe I did, I know I swore him.

6409. It was the practice, I believe; at least it was admitted to be the habit that the cocket should be stamped and signed by the town-clerk before he swore the freemen; is it not so?—No; we give it to him after he is sworn.

6410. Then he may be sworn at one time and get the cocket at any future period; is that the way?—I believe it was the custom.

6411. Then, in point of fact, there may have been several freemen sworn as such who never took out cockets?—No, I believe there were not in my father's time; nobody was sworn who did not take out his cocket.

6412. That is your impression?—Yes; and they were produced when they came to register.

6413. Now Mr. Thomas Morton?—Yes, I prepared his for him, for he had lost it or mislaid it, or something of the kind; he could not find it. I prepared his for him, I know.

6414. And you countersigned?—Perhaps I did.

6415. Have you any doubt about it?—I believe I did.

6416. Could it have been a complete instrument if you did not countersign it?—Indeed, I believe it was.

6417. Did not the mayor sign it?—I should think he did; I know I swore Mr. Morton before the mayor.

6418. Who was the mayor at that time?—That was done at the registry.

6419. Who was the mayor at the time?—Mr. Chaytor, at the time he took it out.

6420. What year was that?—That was in 1832; I believe it was at the time of the first registry.

6421. Then Mr. Chaytor, the mayor, signed and you countersigned the cocket of Mr. Thomas Morton?—I will not be certain I did; I think I did.

6422. Would the document have been complete if you had not countersigned it?—I consider not.

6423. And therefore your impression is you must have countersigned?—I should think so.

6424. And in point of fact that Mr. Thomas Morton had been admitted a freeman in the year 1812?—Yes.

6425. Now tell me whether, from recollection, any such circumstance occurred in any other instance?—No, I do not know of any other.

6426. You do not recollect having in any instance countersigned any cocket of a freeman not admitted while you were town-clerk?—No, I do not.

6427. Mr. *Lefty*.] And the reason you countersigned Mr. Morton's was, that he was sworn by you?—He was sworn by me before the mayor.

6428. And at the time at which you countersigned his cocket?—Yes.

6429. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Was it before or after you had countersigned the cocket, do you recollect?—It was done at the same moment.

6430. You have been stating it was your impression that in every instance in your father's time the stamp duty was paid on the cockets?—I should think it was.

6431. But I think you added, it was not the practice to take them out or sign them; you say a paper was drawn up, but not signed?—A stamp was purchased at the Stamp Office, and it was engrossed; and upon their admission there were, I know, several produced.

6432. But I want to know whether I understood you right; you say that before the Reform Bill it was not the practice to take out the cockets?—It was not in every instance regularly, but there was a hatch made; there were two classes made on the 4th June 1812; there were near forty, and in Sept. 1801 there was a number admitted, and they took out their freedom and paid the stamp duty.

6433. Do you mean to say you can recollect that every one of those persons took out a cocket?—I cannot recollect it; but I know a number did, for a number were produced in my presence.

6434. When?

6434. When?—At the registry.
6435. Mr. *Lefroy*.] Do you know of any one who did not?—I do not know of any one who did not.
6436. And therefore your inference is, they all did it?—My inference is, they all did; I do not think they were perfect freemen until they did do it.
6437. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] So that because you do not think they were perfect freemen until they did it, your impression is, they all did it; is that it?—I know that class of freemen took them out, for they were proud of it; rather proud of being made freemen.
6438. But you say that some of them did?—I know that some did, certainly.
6439. And you infer all did, because you know some did?—I know the great majority of them did, for I saw them.
6440. That is, they were produced at the registry?—Yes; and I engrossed some of them myself for my father.
6441. But you do not know they all did?—No, I will not say all did, but I suppose they did.
6442. Did you not tell me, that before the Reform Bill it was not the practice to take out cockets; perhaps you meant to qualify your answer, and therefore I wish to give you an opportunity of doing so. Then, when you said before the Reform Bill, did you mean to confine your answer to your own time, from 1819?—From 1819 down to the seven I told you that were admitted in the number of years that I was town-clerk, I believe they were not taken out.
6443. Your first answer was, that before the Reform Bill it was not the practice of freemen to stamp cockets or procure them to be stamped; of course you meant to confine your answer to your own time; is not that so?—Yes, it is.
6444. Now, whatever may have been the practice, I believe there is no entry in the corporation books; not a single entry of any stamp duty having been paid in your father's time?—No, not in the books, nor in my time.
6445. Not in your time, because there never was any stamp duty paid then?—Yes, there was a stamp duty paid in every instance by me.
6446. Did you not tell me, that from 1819 to the passing of the Reform Bill, it never was paid in any one instance?—In those seven instances it was not, I believe; I do not think it was.
6447. *Chairman*.] You mean between 1819 and 1832 it was never paid?—Up to 1832.
6448. From 1819 to 1832 no stamp duty was paid; is that what you mean?—I believe not.
6449. But anterior to 1819 you believe the stamp duty was paid?—Yes.
6450. Then, perhaps, you will state to the Committee why there was no stamp duty paid from the year 1819 to the year 1832?—I cannot give any reason for it; there were but few admitted; if there was any number admitted, perhaps it would have been paid.
6451. You say there were seven admitted?—Yes.
6452. But your belief is, that they did not pay the stamp duty?—I believe not.
6453. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Have you any record of the swearing in of the freemen; is not there a roll?—Yes, there is.
6454. Have you got that?—I have.
6455. I ask generally, does it appear from that roll at what periods or at what date the freemen respectively were sworn; are the dates fixed?—They are.
6456. Have you compared them with the dates of the entries of their admissions as freemen, in the book; did you compare them?—No.
6457. Can you state from the document that the freemen admitted in your father's time were sworn at the time of their admission, or about that time?—They were sworn about that time, I suppose.
6458. Are there any dates to those?—No; this is a roll I kept for myself since the Reform Bill.
6459. You have nothing prior to it?—No.
6460. Was there ever a roll kept prior to it of your own knowledge?—There was an entry in a memorandum book of the affidavits, of the freemen's oaths.
6461. Have you got that, because that is the thing I want?—No.
6462. Is not that one of the muniments of the corporation?—It is one I prepared for myself.
6463. Then it was kept only in your time?—Only in my time.

Mr. E. Lubbock.

24 April 1837.

6464. Then, do not you consider that book as one of the muniments of the corporation?—I made it for myself, for my own convenience; merely the oaths.

6465. But does not it strike you as rather an extraordinary thing that there should be no record kept of the swearing in of the freeman at any period; have you, among the books or the muniments of the corporation, any roll, or any list, or any entry of any description, of the swearing in of any freeman anterior to that document in your hand?—No.

6466. Except the seven you stated that were admitted in your time?—They were sworn at the time they were admitted.

6467. You are sure of that?—I am.

6468. And there is no record to show at what period, if at all, any of the freemen anterior to your time were sworn?—No.

6469. There is no record to show that?—No.

6470. Or to show that they were sworn at all?—Nothing to show it; but they were sworn, I can tell you.

6471. How do you know it?—I saw some of them sworn; I will not say all.

6472. That was in your father's time?—Yes.

6473. Before your father's time you could not tell me?—No; I knew nothing about it before then.

6474. Now I asked you before, whether, according to your knowledge of the business of the corporation, it was not the course (speaking of the right by servitude) that the apprenticeship should be served to a freeman, and you mentioned it was the course. Now I ask you whether it was not the course that there should be in every case an indenture of apprenticeship. Do you conceive, that any man claiming his freedom in right of servitude could establish a title to it without showing that he was indentured to his master, and that the master was a freeman?—It was not required of him; it was known he was a freeman, and served his time to a freeman.

6475. And it was not required of him to show he was indentured to the freeman?—No.

6476. And that was the course?—Yes, it was.

6477. And not the course therefore to require the production of the indenture, or any proof of its ever having been executed?—No, it was never required.

6478. Then, for any thing you can tell, in many instances the persons claiming in right of servitude never were indentured?—For any thing I can tell it might be so. And I know some instances in which it was admitted they were not.

6479. Could you specify those instances, or any one?—Mr. David Malcomson's sons.

6480. It was admitted they were never indentured to their father?—It was merely done by an entry in a book; some book kept in the office.

6481. And you have already told us, Mr. David Malcomson was only an honorary freeman?—I do not tell you that; he was admitted by Mr. Bagwell.

6482. He was rejected, first, in Lord Mountcashel's time, claiming in right of marriage?—He was refused.

6483. Then, in December 1800, the transfer was completed of the borough, and in the following year he was admitted by especial favour; he so stated himself. I referred you to his evidence, and you stated you recollected he so stated himself when he was examined before the commissioners?—Yes.

6484. Accordingly, Mr. David Malcomson being himself admitted by especial favour, it now appears on your evidence; am I correct in stating this as the result, that his sons were admitted since the Reform Bill in right of servitude, although it was admitted, when they claimed, that they never had been indentured, and there is only an entry in a book, specifying that they were to become apprentices; is not that so?—Yes.

6485. How many sons has he?—His eldest son refused to take the oath; he has been admitted, and he has refused to be sworn.

6486. When was he admitted?—The 29th March 1833, I think.

6487. What is his eldest son's name?—Joseph Malcomson: here is his freedom prepared by me.

6488. This is the cocket, I suppose?—Yes.

6489. Did he pay the stamp duty?—He did not; it is due to me.

6490. I hope you do not often make these advances?—I am sorry to say I have done it too much.

6491. Mr.

6491. Mr. *Lefroy*.] Are those Mr. Malcomsons registered voters for the borough?—He is not; some are.

6492. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Are all the sons, with the exception of the eldest son, registered voters?—No; Mr. John Malcomson is admitted also, and has not taken out his freedom.

6493. Has Mr. Joshua?—Joshua has.

6494. And Robert?—And Robert.

6495. *Chairman*.] Mr. Joseph Malcomson; how is he registered?—He is registered as a freeman; he is registered twice, as a freeman and as a householder.

6496. How is he entered in that book?—As a householder.

6497. Now then Joseph Malcomson; he is entered as a householder, is he?—

He is.

6498. Is Joshua Malcomson entered as a householder?—I should think he is.

6499. Is Robert Malcomson entered as a householder?—He is.

6500. Are there any other Malcomsons on that list?—I believe not; to my recollection, there were Joseph and Robert registered.

6501. Then Joshua and Robert may also be registered as freemen?—Yes; Joshua is registered as a freeman, and so is Robert.

6502. *Chairman*.] They appear under both classes.

Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] In point of fact, however, Joshua and Robert have both registered as freemen, and also as householders, is not that so?—

Witness.] Joshua has registered as a freeman, and Robert has also registered as a freeman.

6503. And both registered as householders?—They have been registered before as householders.

6504. And it was after having been registered as householders that they registered as freemen, is that it?—Yes.

6505. Where do you find the entry of their having registered as freemen?—*[The witness pointed it out.]*

6506. *Chairman*.] They were registered as householders in October 1832?—Yes.

6507. And as freemen in April 1833?—Yes.

6507*. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Are there any other sons of Mr. David Malcomson the elder who have registered, do you know, or were admitted freemen; there are three admitted freemen, Joseph, Joshua, and Robert; do you know any others?—John.

6508. Now, first of all, is he registered as a freeman?—No.

6509. Are you sure of that?—Upon my word I do not know; I should think he was not. *[The witness referred to the registry.]* No, I do not find him, David Malcomson, junior, registered as a freeman.

6510. Is that another son?—Yes; the 1st of July 1835.

6511. As a freeman; another son of Mr. David Malcomson the elder, is it not?—Yes.

6512. Do you find John's name at all there?—I do not find his.

6513. Has John taken out his freedom?—No, I think not; I think I prepared it for him, but he did not take it.

6514. *Chairman*.] Would he appear in the return made to this Committee?—Yes.

6515. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] By the by it is a very remarkable thing, I do not find David Malcomson's name in this return you have made; how is that? David Malcomson the younger, I do not find his name there?—He was admitted to his freedom. The 30th March 1835, David Malcomson, junior, was admitted.

6516. Then I presume it is your impression that this return you made to the Committee ought to be corrected, and that the name of David Malcomson, junior, ought to be inserted?—Yes.

6517. Well, you have given us instances of persons admitted to their freedom in right of servitude, with respect to whom it was at the same time admitted they had never been indentured to their masters; you specified the sons of David Malcomson the elder; do you recollect any others similarly circumstanced?—The Messrs. Going, I think were; there were no indentures produced.

6518. Well, with respect to them, was it admitted in the same manner as it was in the other cases, that there were no indentures in existence?—I believe it was.

Mr. E. Labarte.

24 April 1837.

6519. Mention the christian names of Messrs. Going?—Ambrose Going, I believe, was one, and John Going.
6520. Was there a James Going?—I dare say there was; I believe there was.
6521. The father's name was Stephen, I think?—Stephen; he was an old freeman.
6522. And these three sons were admitted in right of service, and no indentures produced; and it was admitted that they had not been indentured; now do you recollect any other?—
6523. *Chairman.*] Is there a person called Ambrose Going?—Yes.
6524. He was admitted as a freeman, was he not, on the 1st July 1835?—I believe so.
6525. In right of service?—Yes.
6526. Is he in Clonmel now, or not?—I believe he is not in Clonmel; I believe he is come to Liverpool.
6527. James Going; is that another person that you mentioned?—I believe he is in Clonmel.
6528. They appear on the registry, do they not?—I believe they do.
6529. Entered as freemen?—Yes.
6530. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] You stated the fact that Ambrose Going is removed?—I believe he is.
6531. You do not know whether James is or not?—Yes. John is not.
6532. *Chairman.*] How is John Going entered on the registry?—As a householder.
6533. *Chairman.*] There is Ambrose Going entered as a householder, then another Ambrose Going entered as a freeman; there is James Going entered as a freeman, both of whom appear to have left. And there is a Joseph Going, who is entered as a householder, and who is still at Clonmel.
6534. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Do you know anything of Joseph?—I believe he is still in Clonmel; my impression is, that he is.
6535. James Going; what son was he of the old man?—The third or fourth son.
6536. He was admitted in right of service?—Yes.
6537. Then with respect to Joseph Going; was he a son also, do you know?—He is a son also.
6538. Of the old man?—I should think so.
6539. Then he is admitted as a freeman?—He was admitted a freeman, but he is not on the registry; the barrister refused to register him, I think.
6540. Was he the gentleman you spoke to me about before as the second son?—Yes.
6541. Then it would appear that he is registered as a householder?—
Chairman.] He is registered as a householder.
6542. Now do you recollect any others circumstanced in the same way?—Having no indentures?
6543. Yes, having no indentures?—Thomas Hughes, junior, did not produce his indenture.
6544. With respect to him also, was it admitted that he had not been indentured?—I believe it is the custom with Quakers not to have indentures. It is entered in the book.
6545. These are all Quakers?—Yes, some of them are.
6546. And you state it as your general impression, that it is not their custom to have any?—I believe so.
6547. Do you know Edward Jones, merchant?—He is the eldest son; he was admitted in right of service.
6548. Is he a Quaker too?—No; he was formerly living with Quakers.
6549. Was he indentured?—I believe not.
6550. *Mr. Jeffrey.*] But his service, you say, was to a Quaker?—Yes.
6551. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Now, have you a son who has been admitted to his freedom?—No.
6552. Richard Labarte?—He is my brother.
6553. He was admitted in right of service?—Yes.
6554. Was it to you?—Yes, he served his time to me.
6555. Were you a freeman at the time?—I was.
6556. During the whole time?—Yes.

6557. Was

6557. Was he indentured?—He was. He served his time to me as an attorney.
6558. Was there an indenture?—There was of course a 100 l. stamp.
6559. But did he ever execute an indenture?—To me?
6560. Yes?—He did.
6561. You are quite sure of that?—Quite certain of it. It should be done at the King's Inns in Dublin.
6562. *Chairman.*] If the name of David Malcomson, junior, does not appear in the Return made to this Committee, is that Return correct in that respect?—Certainly not.
6563. Does that gentleman's name appear on the Return made to an order of the House of Commons, which Return was made in the month of June 1835?—It does.
6564. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Now, do you know Mr. Edward Power, merchant?—Yes, I do.
6565. Now, he served his time, I believe, to David Malcomson?—Yes.
6566. I need hardly ask you, after what you have said, whether there was any indenture there?—I believe not; he produced none.
6567. Do you know that, in point of fact, he was a clerk throughout, at a salary?—He was afterwards; after he had served his time.
6568. Are you sure it was after he had served his time?—Yes.
6569. But there was no indenture?—There was none produced.
6570. And David Malcomson, junior, being a Quaker, and it not being his practice to have indentures, have you any doubt that there was no indenture there either?—I suppose not.
6571. Now, do you know Mr. Alexander Harrison?—I do.
6572. He is registered there as a freeman, I believe?—I believe he is.
6573. Well, he served his time to Messrs. Morton and Grubb, did he not?—Yes.
6574. They are Quakers?—Grubb is.
6575. There was no indenture there?—I believe not.
6576. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Do you know there was not?—I do not know there was not.
6577. There was none produced?—There was none produced.
6578. And Mr. Grubb is a Quaker?—He is.
6579. And I believe you have no doubt there was no indenture executed, after what you have stated?—I do not know. I know there was some discussion about it; that there was no indenture produced. Mr. Morton stated he got a fee with him.
6580. Then you recollect there was some discussion about an indenture?—There was.
6581. And that there was none produced?—None produced.
6582. *Chairman.*] Is he registered?—Yes.
6583. At what date was he registered?—The 1st July 1835.
6584. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Now, do you know Samuel Riall?—Yes.
6585. Is he registered?—Yes.
6586. As a freeman?—Yes.
6587. I believe he served his time to Mr. Duckett?—Yes.
6588. Now, do you happen to know whether Mr. Duckett was a freeman at the time when Mr. Samuel Riall served his time to him?—Mr. Duckett had not been admitted when Mr. Riall was bound to him.
6589. Accordingly, Mr. Samuel Riall did not serve the entire of his apprenticeship to a freeman; is not that so?—He had not been admitted as a freeman, but he claimed as a freeman. Mr. Duckett claimed to be entitled to his freedom in right of marriage.
6590. In point of fact, he was not then admitted as a freeman?—No.
6591. When was he admitted as a freeman?—Is his name William Duckett?
6592. Yes.—The 29th of March 1833.
6593. In right of marriage?—Yes.
6594. And Mr. Samuel Riall had been bound apprentice to him before that period?—I believe he had.
6595. Then of course Mr. Samuel Riall did not serve his entire time to a freeman; is not that so?—Mr. Duckett was not a freeman when Mr. Samuel Riall was first apprenticed.
6596. Does it not follow, therefore, in that case that Mr. Samuel Riall's entire

Mr. E. Lebart.

24 April 1837.

time was not served to a freeman, because during part of the time his master was not a freeman?—Yes.

6597. Mr. *Lefroy*.] Was Mr. Duckett married before Mr. Riall went to him as an apprentice?—He was, long before.

6598. And the right attached on his marriage?—Yes, that is the construction.

6599. And that right was afterwards admitted?—Yes.

6600. So that, in point of fact, Mr. Duckett had the right to his freedom when Mr. Riall was apprenticed to him?—Yes.

6601. And that right was afterwards recognized?—Yes.

6602. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] That is, supposing any right to freedom by marriage exists?—Yes.

6603. Mr. *Lefroy*.] And have you any doubt about that?—I do not think it was admitted to be a right before the Reform Bill.

6604. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] And there is not a trace of it on the books of the corporation before the Reform Bill?—No trace on the books, certainly.

6605. Mr. *Lefroy*.] Is there any trace against it?—No.

6606. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Now go to another; Robert Strangman. He was registered as a freeman?—Yes, in right of service.

6607. *Chairman*.] What date?—

Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] 8th April 1833.

Chairman.] Is he on the registry of electors?—

Witness.] I should think he is. He served his time to Mr. David Malcomson.

6608. When was he registered as an elector?

Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] I think he is gone.

6609. *Chairman*.] Was he registered the 8th of April 1833?—He was.

6610. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Now, he served his time to David Malcomson?—Yes.

6611. Are you clear he served his time at all, because he is stated to me to have been a clerk only; do you know the fact?—Yes; I know he served his time to Mr. Malcomson.

6612. Do you know he received a salary as clerk?—Mr. Malcomson invariably gives a salary; the first year he may give nothing; the second year he gives something, and so on until they are out of their time.

6613. So that, in point of fact, Mr. Malcomson's practice is to give a salary to the persons who are called his apprentices; and his practice also is, to have no indenture with his apprentices; is that so?—No indenture that I know of.

6614. That in this instance, and in others, there was no indenture produced?—No.

6615. And, from what you have stated, you apprehend there was none?—I cannot state that.

6616. Have you not told me so in every other instance, it was not the practice of Quakers to have indentures? Do you mean to make this an exception?—I believe there was none.

6617. Now Jonas Shaw; is he registered as a freeman?—I believe so; he is a person who served his time to Morton and Grubb.

6618. *Chairman*.] He was also admitted the 8th of April 1833?—

6619. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Yes, he was. Now he also had no indenture produced there?—No.

6620. And in the same way Mr. Grubb was a Quaker?—He was.

6621. And I presume there was no indenture executed there?—Perhaps not.

6622. Have you any doubt about it?—I believe there was not.

6623. Now Robert Sparrow; do you know him?—I do.

6624. Is he registered as a freeman the 7th April 1835?—He is registered as a freeman.

6625. Do you know to whom he served his time?—To James Burke.

6626. Who is James Burke?—A cloth merchant in Clonmel.

6627. Now was there an indenture produced there?—No.

6628. Have you any doubt there was no indenture there?—I have no doubt about it, but I cannot say.

6629. Was there any discussion about an indenture there?—I do not think there was.

6630. At all events there was none produced?—There was none produced.

6631. Now do you know Joseph Chaytor?—Yes.

6632. He was registered as a freeman, I believe?—Yes.

6633. To

6635. To whom did he serve his time?—I do not know. To a Quaker, I suppose.
6636. Is he a Quaker himself?—He is.
6637. Then there was no indenture there, you suppose?—I suppose not.
6638. Have you any recollection about it?—I have no recollection about it.
6639. But as far as you do recollect anything about it, or can form any impression upon the subject, there was no indenture produced?—No.
6640. Can there have been any mistake in the Return as to this; can you find James Douglas registered the 13th October 1832; he is stated to have been admitted by especial favour; is that so?—He might have been admitted by especial favour originally; it was before my time. I know nothing about it.
6641. Now do you know William Davis?—Yes.
6642. Is he registered as a freeman?—I believe he is.
6643. Do you know to whom he served his time?—Is he an apprentice?
6644. Yes, in right of service.—To his father, I believe.
6645. *Chairman.*] William Davis, shoemaker, is that the man?—No.
6646. *Chairman.*] He is registered as a householder?—
6647. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Is there another William Davis?
6648. *Witness.*] Yes, there is a William Davis, gentleman.
6649. And a freeman; is that the man?—Yes; he is the son of a freeman.
6650. What is his father; is he in trade?—Yes; he has a large shop in Clonmel.
6651. *Chairman.*] He was registered 8th April 1833, was he?—Yes.
6652. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] What is his father's christian name; Samuel?—No; his brother is Samuel.
6653. Well, is he the eldest son, William?—No; Samuel, I think, is the eldest son.
6654. Is that your impression?—I believe he is.
6655. Do you happen to know when his father was admitted a freeman?—I do not.
6656. What is his father's christian name?—Robert; he did not register as a freeman, I think.
6657. No. Well, be so good as to look at this, and tell me if he does not appear to have been admitted a freeman the 29th March 1833?—I should think he was admitted a freeman.
6658. The 29th March 1833?—Yes; Robert Davis of Clonmel, gentleman.
6659. Do you see that?—I do.
6660. Now, if he were admitted to his freedom only on the 29th of March 1833, I believe his son, who served his time to him, and registered the 8th April 1833, could not have served much of his time as a freeman. William Davis the son, you say, served his time to his father Robert Davis?—No; I think he served his time to Thomas Hughes.
6661. Who is Thomas Hughes?—He is an old freeman; 1812 is his admission as a freeman.
6662. Then was he any relation of William Davis?—No; he is a partner with him, I believe, now.
6663. But was there any indenture in that case?—I suppose like the rest.
6664. Are they all Quakers?—All Quakers.
6665. Then you assume there was no indenture, and none was produced?—None was produced.
6666. Then you have no reason for knowing he served his apprenticeship to Thomas Hughes?—I will be able to tell you, because I can find the memorial. William Davis, he served his time to Thomas Hughes; here is the memorial.
- [Handing it to Mr. Serjeant Ball.]
6667. Now, do you know William Edmondson, junior, Johnson-street?—Yes.
6668. Did he register as a freeman?—He did.
6669. It was in right of service that he was admitted?—Yes.
6670. To whom did he serve his time?—I believe to his father.
6671. Now, when was William Edmondson, senior, admitted to his freedom?—He is a very old freeman; forty years, I suppose.
6672. Are they Quakers?—No.
6673. Was any indenture produced there?—No.
6674. And you have no reason to suppose there was any?—No.
6675. Joshua

Mr. E. Lubart.

6671. Joshua Grubb, we have not had him before; Joshua Grubb, 8th April 1833?—

6672. Is he registered as a freeman?—He is.

6673. In right of service?—Yes.

6674. To whom did he serve his time?—To his father.

6675. Are they Quakers?—They are.

6676. And there is no indenture there?—I believe not.

6677. None produced?—None produced.

6678. Now, Stephen Gordon; did he register as a freeman?—He did.

6679. In right of service?—In right of service.

6680. And to whom did he serve his time?—To William Duckett.

6681. Now had William Duckett been a freeman during the whole of the period of the apprenticeship?—He was not admitted.

6682. So that, for a part of the period of the apprenticeship, Stephen Gordon did not serve his time to a freeman?—He did not serve the whole of the period of his apprenticeship to a freeman; he did not serve the whole of his time to William Duckett, when a freeman.

6683. Now Robert F. G. Howell; do you know him?—Yes.

6684. Did he register as a freeman?—I believe he did.

6685. And was he admitted to his freedom in right of service?—Yes.

6686. To whom did he serve his time?—I believe to Morton and Grubb.

6687. And in like manner, I presume, there was no indenture there either?—No; there was none produced.

6688. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And of course you believe there was none?—

Chairman.] That is the 8th April 1833, is it not?—

Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Yes.

6689. Now do you know Charles Achison, of Johnson-street?—Yes.

6690. Was he registered as a freeman?—I believe he was.

6691. He was admitted in right of service?—I believe so.

6692. Do you know to whom he served his time?—I believe to David Malcomson.

6693. Was he a Quaker, Charles Achison?—No; I believe not.

6694. But David Malcomson was?—Yes.

6695. I presume there was no indenture there?—I believe not; I do not know.

6696. And there was a payment of salary there, I presume?—Mr. Malcomson's habit is to give a salary.

6697. Do you know at what period Charles Achison served his time to Mr. Malcomson?—A good while since.

6698. Would you be surprised to hear it was before Mr. Malcomson himself was admitted to his freedom; before 1801?—I do not know it was.

6699. What age is Mr. Achison?—He is a young man.

6700. Is he 50?—No.

6701. Is he 40?—He may be 40; I am sure he is not 50.

6702. You do not know at what time it was he served his time to Mr. Malcomson?—No.

6703. And of course you cannot tell whether Mr. Malcomson himself was a freeman at the time or not?—No; I cannot.

6704. Do you know James Burke?—I do.

6705. Did he register as a freeman?—I believe he did.

6706. Was he admitted in right of service?—I believe he was.

6707. Now to whom, do you know, did he serve his time?—

Chairman.] He is also admitted as a householder, is not he?—He is; he registered in both.

6708. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] He was admitted in right of service?—Yes.

6709. To whom?—I believe to Jeremiah Nolan.

6710. *Chairman.*] He was admitted as householder in October 1832, was he?—I believe he was.

6711. And admitted as a freeman in April 1834?—Yes.

6712. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now are these Quakers, Jeremiah Nolan and James Burke?—No.

6713. Were any indentures produced there?—No.

6714. And you have no reason to suppose there was any; is that so?—I know nothing about it.

6715. Now do you know the Rev. Robert Bell?—I do.

6716. Is he son to Dr. Bell?—He is.
6717. I believe that that Dr. Bell was admitted in right of marriage?—Yes.
6718. And the Rev. Robert Bell was admitted in right of birth, as his eldest son?—Yes.
6719. So that if the right by marriage cannot be established, that is to say, if the father, Dr. Bell, was not entitled to his freedom, his son, the Rev. Robert Bell, claiming as such, cannot be entitled either; is not that so?—One would think so.
6720. *Chairman.*] Does not the Reverend Robert Bell appear on the registry as a householder also?—That is Doctor Bell, I believe.
6721. No, the Reverend Robert Bell; is he the master of the endowed school?—He is.
6722. Does he not appear as a householder on the registry?—Doctor Bell does, but the son does not.
6723. Just look; carry your eye down there.—Yes; Robert Bell, master of the endowed school, he is a freeman. The son is a freeman.
6724. Does not he appear on the registry as a householder?—He does.
6725. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] I have asked you some questions about Robert Howell before us to indentures; Robert Howell, do you recollect him?—Yes.
6726. In addition to what I have asked you, do you happen to know he ceased to reside in Clonmel for some time after he had registered; he registered the 8th April 1833; do you happen to be aware he went to reside at Castle Bellingham or some other place in the North of Ireland, and continued to reside there a considerable time?—I know he went to the North, but he did not continue there long. I think he did go to Castle Bellingham.
6727. For how long?—I know he staid a very short time and came back.
6728. He came back a few days before the last election?—He did.
6729. Do you mean before the last election of all, or before the last contested election?—Before the last contested election.
6730. You cannot say how long he remained away; has he a residence in Clonmel?—I believe he lives in Danganman; he ceased to reside in Clonmel, certainly.
6731. Your impression is, he ceased to reside there?—Yes.
6732. Do you know William Quinn?—I do.
6733. Is he registered as a freeman?—He is.
6734. Do you know his residence?—Lolohar.
6735. Now I believe Lolohar is not within the borough of Clonmel?—It is not. It is within the prescribed limits.
6736. It is within the limits prescribed by the Reform Bill, but not within the borough?—No.
6737. *Chairman.*] Admitted the 8th of April 1833, was he?—I believe so.
6738. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] At the time when he was admitted a freeman he was living at the same place, Lolohar?—Yes.
6739. And, of course, when he was registered he was not resident within the borough?—No.
6740. Do you know a person of the name of Jackson, a Quaker?—Yes, Thomas Jackson.
6741. Well, he is registered a freeman, is not he?—Yes.
6742. Well, I believe he resides at a place called Tennycurry?—Yes.
6743. Where did he reside when he was admitted to his freedom?—I do not know.
6744. At all events his present residence is at Tennycurry?—Yes.
6745. And that is not within the borough?—No. He had a house also in Clonmel.
6746. Had he at the time of his registry?—Yes, I believe he had.
6747. But he has since given up his house there, and is living in Tennycurry?—Yes. He is gone to live at his family residence.
6748. When you were examined before the Corporation Commissioners, do you recollect to have been asked the question as to whether the eldest sons of persons admitted by especial favour were entitled to their freedom?—I believe I was asked it.
6749. Whether it was your impression that the eldest sons of persons admitted to their freedom by especial favour, were entitled, as such, to claim their freedom; do you remember being asked that question?—I believe I was asked it.

Mr. E. Leaberts.

24 April 1837.

6750. Do you remember the answer you gave?—Indeed I do not.

6751. May I ask you, then, will you be so good as give me an answer now?—What is your question?

6752. I must ask you the question again, perhaps you may recollect. Do you remember, when you were examined before the Corporation Commissioners, to have been asked the question, whether it was your impression that the eldest sons of freemen, admitted by especial favour, were entitled to their freedom as such eldest sons of honorary freemen; do you remember being asked that question?—Eldest sons of freemen admitted by especial favour.

6753. I am speaking now before the Reform Bill, not since. I am speaking of freemen admitted by especial favour before the Reform Bill; do you recollect being asked that question, and what answer you made?—I do not recollect being asked that question at all.

6754. Well then, of course you do not recollect having given any answer to it?—I do not.

6755. Let me put that question to you. Do you consider, from what you know of the laws of the corporation or the habits of it, do you consider that the eldest son of a freeman, an honorary freeman, a person admitted by especial favour before the Reform Bill, is entitled to vote as such eldest son?—I do think he is entitled to vote.

6756. You do not recollect then having been asked that question, and having stated the reverse before the commissioners?—No, I do not. I do not recollect such a thing at all.

6757. And you state now your impression is, that the eldest son of an honorary freeman, admitted as an honorary freeman before the Reform Bill, is entitled in right of birth to be admitted a freeman himself?—I do, and has a right of voting.

6758. Do you know Hill Harvey?—Yes, I do.

6759. I believe he registered as a freeman?—I believe he did.

6760. Do you know where he resides?—He resides with Mr. Malcomson, at Portlaw.

6761. What is the distance; 14 or 16 miles from Clonmel?—Yes.

6762. Then that is not within the borough?—No.

6763. Then if Mr. Hill Harvey was a resident in the borough at the time when he obtained his freedom, he must have since changed his residence?—Yes.

6764. If he were resident at the time when he obtained his freedom, he certainly must have ceased to reside within the borough since; is it not so?—Yes.

6765. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Is he returned as removed?—

Chairman.]—No.

Witness.] He is removed; he does not live in Clonmel now.

6766. Chairman.] Does this John Hill Harvey appear by any mark in this corrected book to have removed?—I do not think that is the same person we are speaking of.

6767. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Is there any Harvey that is marked off there?—No.

6768. Do you know Steven C. Moore, who was registered the 6th of January 1834?—Yes.

6769. Whose son is he?—The eldest son of Stephen Moore, of Barn.

6770. His father is living?—He is.

6771. Then do you conceive he claimed in right of birth?—He did.

6772. And is it the practice for the eldest sons of freemen to claim in right of birth in the lifetime of their father?—It is.

6773. You state that is the practice?—It is.

6774. I asked you before about William Henry Riall; I believe he is the mayor?—Yes.

6775. And I asked you whether you were quite sure he is the eldest son of his father?—He is.

6776. Is it not the fact that his father had an elder son who has since died?—No, I should think not; he had a son that died, but he died before he was of age. I was at school with him; he was a young boy, and this is an older man, I think.

6777. Your impression is that his elder brother did not attain his full age; but that he had an elder brother; is not that so?—Yes.

6778. You think Henry Riall is the eldest son?—I do.

6779. Before

6779. Before your father became town-clerk, I want to know is there any record, or have you any means of knowing, that the stamp duty was paid upon the admission of any freeman admitted?—In his time?
6780. No, before his time. Do you know any thing about it?—I do not.
6781. There is nothing on this record to show it was ever paid?—No.
6782. And you have no means of knowing?—No.

Mr. E. Labarte.

24 April 1837.

Joris, 27^o die Aprilis, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Serjeant Bull.
Mr. O'Connell.
Mr. M. J. O'Connell.
Sir Robert Ferguson.
Mr. More O'Ferrall.
Mr. French.

Mr. Milnes Gaskell.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Hogg.
Mr. Serjeant Jackson.
Mr. Lefroy.
Lord Granville Somerset.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Edward Labarte, called in; and further Examined.

6783. Mr. Serjeant Bull.] UPON a former day, you were in the course of examination with respect to the freemen: you know the Messrs. Riall; Arthur Riall and Phineas Riall?—Phineas Riall is the eldest son of Charles Riall.

Mr. E. Labarte.

27 April 1837.

6784. Did he reside in Clonmel when he was admitted to his freedom?—He did; he is now living in the county of Wicklow.

6785. Now, William H. Riall?—He is the eldest son of William Riall, a banker; he is the mayor of Clonmel.

6786. Is not Phineas Riall a son of the banker?—Yes; two brothers are in the bank.

6787. Which is the eldest of the three?—I think William Riall is the eldest.

6788. Are you aware that Phineas Riall, who must be a second son, was admitted in right of birth?—He is the elder son of Charles Riall; the other is the eldest son of William Riall.

6789. Who is the third of the name of Riall?—The third is Charles Riall.

6790. Is he the eldest son of any one?—He is the younger son of the elder branch.

6791. How is he admitted?—In right of birth.

6792. And yet a second son?—He is the elder son of his father; but his father was admitted by special favour.

6793. Do you mean to say that Phineas Riall, William H. Riall, and Charles Riall, are all three eldest sons of somebody?—Yes.

6794. None of them is the second son of any one?—Elder sons. The eldest son is Phineas Riall; William Riall's eldest son is William Henry Riall. There is a third son of an elder branch, but he has no children.

6795. When you say that William Henry Riall is the eldest son of William Riall, do you mean to say that he is the eldest born son? Was not there an elder son?—I do not know whether there was an elder son or not, but there was a son who died at 16; whether he was the elder or not, I do not know.

6796. Do you know Arthur Riall?—I do.

6797. He is registered as a freeman?—He is.

6798. Was he the eldest son of his father?—No; I believe he was the younger.

6799. Do you know whether he was admitted in right of birth or not?—No. I do not suppose he was admitted in right of birth. He was admitted 30 years ago, at least.

6800. Where does he reside?—He resides near Woodroffe; I suppose four or five miles from Clonmel.

6801. Not within the limits of the borough?—No; he lives five miles out of Clonmel.

6802. Therefore he is a non-resident!—He is a non-resident at present.

6803. Do you know where he lived when he was admitted to his freedom?—I should think, at the banking house in Clonmel; he lived there as long as I remember.

Mr. E. Lohrie.

27 April 1837.

6804. Were you living at Clonmel in 1800?—No; I lived in the county of Cork.
6805. Therefore you cannot say where Arthur Riall lived in 1800?—No.
6806. Are you aware that it was in 1800 that he was admitted to his freedom?—Yes.
6807. You say that Phineas Riall resides in the county of Wicklow?—The young man does at present.
6808. Where does Charles Riall reside?—He lives at Heywood, within a mile of Clonmel.
6809. Is it within the limits of the borough?—I cannot say.
6810. Of course you cannot tell where he resided when he was admitted to his freedom?—I suppose he was living at his residence.
6811. Do you know William Riall?—Yes, I do; I know them all.
6812. Where does he reside?—He lives at Hammerville.
6813. Is that within the limits of the borough?—There is ground of the corporation below it; I am told that part of the corporation ground is below it.
6814. Is it within the limits over which the corporation jurisdiction extends?—No, it is not.
6815. Whose son was he?—He was the elder son of his father, whoever his father was.
6816. Do you know a person of the name of Abraham Grubb; when was he admitted?—He is an old person.
6817. Was not he admitted in 1833?—No; there is no young person of the name of Abraham Grubb.
6818. Where does he reside?—Just adjoining the town, at Merlin.
6819. Is it within the limits of the borough?—I am told it is; he carries on business in town also.
6820. Is his residence within the limits of the borough?—I should think it is, but I am not sure of it.
6821. As you are the town-clerk, is not it your business to know the limits of the corporation, of which you are town-clerk?—I do not think it is.
6822. Therefore, in your opinion, it is not the business of the town-clerk to know anything about the limits of the jurisdiction?—I know that if Mr. Grubb came to me for a summons, I would give it to him.
6823. Do not you consider it is the business of the town-clerk to know the limits of the corporation to which he belongs?—I think it is too extensive for me to know it.
6824. Then you do not consider it is the business of the town-clerk to know the limits of the corporation to which he belongs?—No, I do not; I learn it from others when I want to find it out.
6825. Do you know whether it is the business of any person connected with the corporation to know its limits?—I do not think it is the business of anybody. I have given law processes to what I thought were the limits, and if Mr. Grubb wanted a law process to-morrow, I would give it to him for his plea, considering it within the limits.
6826. You do not consider it is the business either of yourself or of any other person to know the limits of the corporation of Clonmel?—I do not.
6827. Do you know Thomas Taylor?—I do.
6828. Where does he reside?—He resides outside the town; I believe that is outside the limits, but he also has a residence in the town of Clonmel.
6829. Does he reside in both?—He is in the town every day, at his office in the town. It was an office he made a great deal of money in, and he still keeps it; and there he receives his rents.
6830. Does he reside there?—No; it is a residence, but he does not reside at it, but he sits in the parlour or in the drawing-room; I do not believe he sleeps there.
6831. He uses it as a place of business?—I have often gone into the drawing-room, and sat down and conversed with him on business.
6832. Do you mean to say that all those circumstances make out that that is a residence?—He could reside there if he wished; I do not suppose he sleeps there, but he is there every day almost.
6833. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Do you know whether or not he sleeps there occasionally?—I do not.
6834. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then you do not know whether it is his residence or

or not?—It is not his residence; he does not live there; I suppose he lives in the country.

6835. Have you any doubt of it?—I have no doubt that his residence is in the country.

6836. And he has a place of business in the town?—Yes.

6837. Is not his residence without the limits of the borough, at Bird's Hill?—I believe it is.

6838. Have you any doubt about it?—I do not doubt but it is outside the limits of the corporation.

6839. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Is your knowledge of the limits of the borough sufficient to enable you to speak with certainty as to any person being within or without it?—It is.

6840. In this instance can you go beyond a belief?—I am not certain that I could.

6841. The Rev. Langer Carey, do you know him?—I do; he is my brother-in-law.

6842. He was admitted a freeman in 1812?—He was.

6843. Where does he reside?—He resides at present at Glen-abbey, within two miles of Clonmel; but he did reside in the town.

6844. Is Glen-abbey within or without the limits of the corporation?—It is without the limits.

6845. Is it further from the town than the residence of Thomas Taylor at Bird's Hill?—It is further; it is on the river side of the town; I believe they are both without the limits.

6846. Do you recollect his admission as a freeman; were you then acting for your father as town-clerk?—I was.

6847. Can you say whether he was sworn as a freeman?—I should think he was.

6848. Were you present?—I think I was not.

6849. Have you any entry in the corporation books of his having been sworn as a freeman?—No.

6850. Do you know whether the stamp duty was paid?—I should think it was; he was refused to be registered as a freeman by Mr. Guthrie, and he was admitted on an appeal: there were about 26 admitted on appeal by the judge, who had been rejected by Mr. Guthrie; they appealed from him, and they were admitted.

6851. Chairman.] They were rejected by Mr. Guthrie upon the first revision of the electors after the Reform Bill; they appealed to the judge, and they were admitted by the judge upon appeal?—They were.

6852. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Who was the judge?—Baron Foster.

6853. You say you think he paid the stamp duty, because he was admitted upon appeal?—All those that were admitted paid the stamp duty.

6854. Do you take upon you to say that every freeman who was admitted to register, produced before the barrister his copy?—No, I will not.

6855. Were there cases in which freemen were admitted to register without producing their copy?—There were.

6856. Of course then there were cases in which the mere fact of the party being admitted to register was no proof of his having paid the stamp duty?—The length of time he was admitted was considered a proof that he paid it; they were admitted over 30 years, and it was considered that any man that was admitted over 30 years was a proof of his having paid the stamp duty; or 20 years, I believe it was.

6857. By whom was that considered?—I believe by the judge, Baron Foster; that it was *prima facie* evidence of its having been paid.

6858. Evidence of his admission into the corporation book?—Yes.

6859. Is there a single instance in which the admission of a freeman in the corporation book appears to be stamped?—No.

6860. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Were you present upon this occasion, when Baron Foster decided that?—I was the attorney.

6861. Did you hear him state the ground of his judgment?—I think that was the ground upon which he admitted. I am not certain of it; but it was argued by counsel that, if they were 20 or 30 years admitted, it was considered that they had paid the stamp duty.

6862. Are you sure that the Baron gave a judgment, and stated his reasons for

Mr. E. Labadie.
27 April 1837.

for his decision?—I think he gave reasons for it, and I think that was the reason he gave.

6863. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You were concerned as attorney for the freemen?—For Mr. Bagwell.

6864. Is not that the same thing?—It is.

6865. Of course you were attentive to what was going on?—I should think I was.

6866. You say it was considered that where a freeman appeared by the corporation book to have been admitted 20 or 30 years, that was deemed evidence of his having paid the stamp duty, and in those cases he did not produce his copy?—In some instances they did not.

6867. Was not the evidence of his having been admitted the entry in the corporation book?—Yes, I should think it was.

6868. Is there any single instance in which any admission of freemen in the corporation book appears to be stamped?—No.

6869. And, accordingly, it comes to this, that whereas the only mode of ascertaining whether the claimant was a freeman or not was the entry in the corporation book, and that entry was not stamped; still, where that entry was made 20 or 30 years before, it was considered to be evidence of the stamp duty having been paid?—Yes.

6870. And in this way, how many freemen were admitted by Baron Foster?—I think there were 26 appeals.

6871. Did they all succeed?—They did; I think they were all persons admitted in 1812.

6872. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Did it appear, upon that occasion, whether they had ever exercised the rights of freemen in any respect before?—Yes, that was also proved.

6873. Did the Baron rest his judgment upon this, that it was presumed that at that distance of time all had been regularly done, seeing that those persons had exercised all the privileges of freemen antecedently?—Yes; I think that was a further ground of his decision.

6874. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Can you mention any acts of freemen that any of those persons were proved to have done?—That they passed different commodities, cattle and so on, free of toll.

6875. Do you mean to say that the fact of a man not having paid toll in Clonmel is deemed evidence of his being a freeman?—I should think it was, at that time; persons that exercised the right of passing corn and cattle, and so on, free of toll, did it in exercise of the right of freemen.

6876. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] You would not say that a person refusing to pay toll, merely because he resisted the corporation, would give him a right to the freedom?—Certainly not.

6877. But you would say that if a person claimed to bring his goods in without toll, and was allowed to exercise that right, that was evidence of his being a freeman?—Yes.

6878. Is it a privilege of the freemen of Clonmel to be exempt from the payment of toll?—It is.

6879. And in the exercise of that privilege, those persons came within the rules?—Yes.

6880. And it appeared that they had been doing so from the year 1812 to the time when the question of registry arose?—Yes.

6881. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you mean to say that that appeared in every instance?—It was not required in every instance, but it was the general evidence given.

6882. But you are sure that the corporation book was produced?—It was; there were counsel employed to argue those cases.

6883. You know Barclay Cuthbert?—Yes.

6884. He lives at a place called Anner-mills?—He does.

6885. Is that within or without the limits of the borough?—I believe it is without.

6886. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] How far do the limits on that side extend?—I have heard that some of the ground below Anner-mills is within the limits of the corporation.

6887. Are not Anner-mills two miles from Clonmel?—They are less than two miles.

6888. There

6888. There is a river that passes across the road, and a bridge, just at Anner-mills?—There is the river Anner. He lives just close to the bridge.

6889. Do not you know that the limit of Clonmel borough extends further from the town than that bridge and river in some parts?—I am told that there is property belonging to the corporation further off, within the limits of the borough.

6890. You cannot take upon yourself to say, whether this precise spot is within the limits of the borough or not?—I cannot.

6891. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] What right of property have the corporation exercised over the spot that you speak of; have they ever exercised any?—Not that I know of.

6892. Then when you say you are told that the corporation have property there, you mean that they have a claim to property there?—They have a claim to property, and I believe they have property.

6893. What right of property have they ever exercised?—I dare say they receive the rents.

6894. Would not you know it if it be so?—No; the chamberlain is the person to receive the rents.

6895. You do not know whether they exercise any right of property there or not?—I do not know it; I have heard it; that is all that I can say about it.

6896. *Chairman*.] Do you believe it?—I believe they do.

6897. It does not come under your official knowledge?—No, it does not.

6898. Mr. Serjeant *Jackson*.] It is in the department of the chamberlain of the corporation?—It is.

6899. Who is the chamberlain?—Mr. Douglas.

6900. Is he here?—No.

6901. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] It is Mr. Barclay Clibborn, jun., of whom you have been speaking?—Yes; he is the eldest son of Clibborn, of Two-mile Bridge.

6902. Do you know William Quin, jun.?—Yes; I think I spoke of him the last day; of *Lobber*.

6903. Is that within the limits of the corporation?—It is within six miles of Clonmel; it is not within the limits of the corporation.

6904. Whose son is he?—He is the elder son of Billy Quin.

6905. Is he the eldest born son?—I do not know that; I have never heard of any other.

6906. Do you know Richard Carey?—Yes; he is the elder son of Langer Carey.

6907. Mr. Serjeant *Jackson*.] Is it any part of the business of the town-clerk of this borough to be acquainted with the genealogies of all these people?—I do not think it is.

6908. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] Is it any part of the business of the town-clerk to know, when a person comes to claim his freedom, whether the right in which he claims is well founded or not?—No, I do not think it is.

6909. So that if a man claims his freedom as the eldest son, it is no part of the business of the town-clerk to know or care whether he is the eldest son or not?—No, I do not think it is. I would have no right to refuse sending forward his petition, and let the council approve of it.

6910. You take no more concern about it?—I do not think it would be my business to take more notice about it.

6911. The right of admission is not with you?—No, it is with the council.

6912. Mr. Serjeant *Jackson*.] And the judging whether a party makes out his title is no part of your duty?—It is not.

6913. You are merely ministerial in forwarding his petition?—Yes.

6914. And you have nothing to do with deciding whether he is entitled?—No.

6915. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] So that if you knew that a man who claimed his freedom as the eldest son was, in point of fact, a younger son, you would not consider it part of your duty to apprise the corporation of that fact?—No, I would not.

6916. Mr. Serjeant *Jackson*.] But you would do it probably?—I think I would; I would give any information I knew about it.

6917. *Chairman*.] Is not the mode of election by the burgesses?—It is.

6918. If the majority of the council approves of a man, he is admitted as a freeman?—Yes.

Mr. E. Laborte.

27 April 1837.

6919. But the freemen as a body are not permitted to be present at the council?—No, the council are the only persons present.
6920. The burgesses are a distinct body from the freemen?—They are.
6921. And it is in their sole will and pleasure who shall be admitted, in connexion with the mayor and bailiffs?—Yes.
6922. But the town-clerk has no ministerial duty upon that subject?—No; I am merely their clerk.
6923. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.]* Where does Richard Carcy reside?—At Glen-abbey, with his father.
6924. Which is without the limits of the corporation?—I believe it is.
6925. Do you know Thomas Jackson, of Tineurry?—Yes.
6926. Is that within or without the limits?—It is without, certainly.
6927. *Chairman.]* He has removed, has not he?—He has.
6928. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.]* Has he left the neighbourhood altogether?—I should think he has.
6929. Do you know a freeman of the name of James Smith?—There is a person of that name admitted to the freedom; he has not taken it out; James R. Smith; he is brother to Lady Osborne; he is living in the town; I believe he is registered as a householder.
6930. Does he reside at Newtown?—No; he has a house in Clonmel.
6931. Does he live there?—He does; he is married, and lives there.
6932. Do you know another James R. Smith?—There is another James Smith in Johnson-street.
6933. Do you know any Smith living at Newtown?—No; Mr. James R. Smith did live at Newtown, at Lady Osborne's, when she was away; but he has ceased to live there these two years.
6934. You know Mr. Stephen Moore, of Barn?—I do.
6935. Is Barn within the limits of the corporation?—I should think it is outside the limits of the town; it is four miles from Clonmel.
6936. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.]* Do your liberties extend four miles in any direction?—They do, in the county of Waterford.
6937. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.]* Is he the eldest son of his father?—I should imagine he is; he has a very fine property by his uncle.
6938. Is not his father living?—No.
6939. Are there two Stephen Moores, of Barn?—He is the son of that Stephen Moore.
6940. Is not his name Stephen?—Yes.
6941. Has he a family?—He has.
6942. And registered?—And registered.
6943. Is not his father living?—He is.
6944. He registered in the right of birth?—Yes.
6945. Does he reside with his father, at Barn?—I do not believe he does; I believe he has a place at the Cove of Cork now.
6946. A residence?—Yes; but he had a residence at his father's also; he is married, and he lived at his father's after being married.
6947. Where does he live now?—I believe, in the Cove of Cork.
6948. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.]* Do you know whether or not he resides occasionally within the neighbourhood of Clonmel?—I know he was at his father's when I came up.
6949. How long had he been there?—As well as I can recollect, he was there a week or two, or three.
6950. You do not know how long precisely?—No, I do not.
6951. And he was there before that?—He was.
6952. Has he been often there before that?—He has; but I could not call it his residence; for I believe he has one of his own at the Cove of Cork.
6953. Has his wife been there with him?—Yes.
6954. And his children?—One child.
6955. Has he staid there for weeks at a time?—I know he has been there three or four weeks.
6956. With his wife and his child?—Yes.
6957. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.]* Is that what you call being upon a visit occasionally?—I should imagine that it was.
6958. Do you know John Farrell?—I do.
6959. Where does he reside?—I believe, at Marefield.

6960. Yes

6960. You have said that Marefield is not within the limits of the corporation?—I believe it is outside.
6961. Whose son is he?—I believe, Paddy Farrell.
6962. Is Paddy Farrell living or dead?—He is dead.
6963. Do you know John Bagwell, of Glencannon?—He has removed; I believe he is in France.
6964. Is there a William Harvey, of Coleville?—Yes.
6965. Is Coleville within the limits of the corporation?—I know he considers his place as outside of the corporation; he resided at Clonmel when he was admitted.
6966. When was he admitted?—I suppose more than 20 years ago.
6967. How can you take upon yourself to say he resided in Clonmel more than 20 years ago?—I know that he did.
6968. When was he admitted?—He is styled of Clonmel, a shopkeeper, when he was admitted in 1802.
6969. Mr. Lefroy.] Do you know that he did not reside in Clonmel at that time?—No; I believe he resided in Clonmel at that time.
6970. With respect to the several persons as to whose residence you have been asked, do you mean to say that at the time of their respective admissions, they were non-resident or residing out of the limits of the corporation, or only at present?—Some did, both at the time of their admission and at present.
6971. Have you specified in your answers which?—I have stated as well as I could, whether it was inside or outside of the corporation.
6972. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you know Thomas Beeby of Marefield?—I do.
6973. You have already said that Marefield is without the limits?—Yes.
6974. Do you know when he was admitted?—About 1833 or 1832.
6975. At the time of his admission, have you any doubt that he resided at Marefield?—No.
6976. Then of course, at the time of his admission, he resided without the limits of the corporation?—Yes.
6977. Do you know whose son he was?—The son of Nathan Beeby.
6978. Was he the only son?—He was the elder son of his father, as I know it.
6979. Joseph Chaytor, do you know him?—He is clerk in the bank; he lives outside the town, I believe.
6980. When was he admitted?—Either 1832 or 1833.
6981. Did not he reside outside the limits of the corporation before he was admitted?—He did; but he carried on business in Clonmel.
6982. Do you know Edward Kellett?—He is dead; he died about a month ago.
6983. Do you know Mr. Moore Loharte?—I do.
6984. Where does he reside?—I believe he has removed to Dublin; he was registered in Clonmel about a year ago.
6985. Had he removed before he was registered?—No.
6986. Richard Pennefather, of Darling-hill?—He is the son of Baron Pennefather.
6987. Darling-hill is not within the limits of the corporation?—No.
6988. He was admitted in 1832 or 1833; he was not then residing within the limits of the corporation?—No, he was not.
6989. William Perry, of Woodroffe; is Woodroffe within the limits of the corporation?—It is.
6990. Was he residing without the limits of the corporation when he was admitted in 1833?—He was; but he was living about four miles from Clonmel.
6991. How far is Darling-hill?—Four miles and a half.
6992. Thomas Ryan, of Cottage; is that within the limits of the corporation?—No; it is about four miles distant from Clonmel.
6993. Do you know whose son he was?—I believe, a son of Thomas Ryan.
6994. Do you know his father?—I have seen him.
6995. Had this Thomas Ryan no brothers?—He has a younger brother, but no elder brother; he was the eldest son, as far as I know.
6996. Have you ever heard of such a thing as a D'Oyer Hundred Jury?—It is a history in the Irish journals, I believe; it was produced, I believe, by Mr.

Mr. E. Lobarte.

27 April 1837.

John Green, the attorney; there was some evidence given of it before the Corporation Commissioners.

6997. Mr. *Hawilton*.] Can you state what it is?—No, I cannot; I do not know anything about it; I merely heard it at the time.

6998. *Chairman*.] Is not it mentioned in the Corporation Report, that it was stated that, in the year 1787, it appears that some persons were made free of the corporation by order of that jury?—I believe it is.

6999. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson*.] Have you in Clonmel any court of d'oyer hundred?—No.

7000. You know that they have in Cork?—I believe that they have.

7001. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Have you read the Report of the Corporation Commissioners?—No, I have not.

7002. Were you examined as a witness by the Commissioners?—I was.

7003. And you were present at the greater part of the evidence that was taken?—I was.

7004. Did not you hear something of the evidence of Mr. Green?—Mr. Green produced a Report to the Irish House of Commons.

7005. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson*.] Have you in Clonmel any general assembly of the freemen at large, as they have in Cork?—No; I have never seen it in Clonmel.

7006. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Could you, by reference to the corporation books, state at what period the last d'oyer hundred jury was held?—No.

7007. Are you aware of any entry of the subject in the books?—No, I am not aware of it.

7008. You have heard of Morgan, the Mayor of Clonmel, as connected with 1748?—Yes, Hercules Morgan.

7009. Will you look at the corporation book, and state whether you find a bye-law, dated the 19th of April 1748, to the effect stated in the Report of the Corporation Commissioners with reference to Clonmel?—I do.

7010. Now will you go on to 1750; do you find in the corporation book a bye-law, dated the 21st of December 1750, to the effect stated in the same Report of the Commissioners?—I do.

7011. Will you go on now to 1754, and state whether you find in the corporation book a bye-law, dated the 10th of June 1754, to the effect stated in the same Report?—Yes, I do.

7012. Do you observe, with reference to this bye-law of 1754, that there is no authentication of it except what purports to be the signature of the Mayor?—Nothing more.

7013. You were examined as a witness on this inquiry before the commissioners; were you present when evidence was given with reference to an election petition which had been prosecuted by Mr. William Bagwell, in the year 1756, against a Return made to the House of Commons?—I was.

7014. Had you heard the evidence given with respect to this petition?—I did hear some evidence given.

7015. By the fifth volume of the Journals of the House of Commons of Ireland, page 332, dated the 19th of January 1756, it appears that the validity of this bye-law of the 10th of June 1754, repealing the former bye-law of the 21st of December of 1750, was impugned by the petition; you heard evidence given upon that subject before the Corporation Commissioners?—I believe I did.

7016. And you heard it stated that that petition, so impugning this last-mentioned bye-law of the 10th of June 1754 as illegal and void, succeeded, and that Mr. William Bagwell was declared the sitting Member?—I believe I did.

7017. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson*.] Have you any recollection of that evidence?—There was evidence given of it by Mr. John Green, the attorney.

7018. Do you recollect anything of the purport of the evidence?—I do not; but I know that such evidence was given.

7019. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] When was Mr. Richard Moore, the barrister, admitted?—In 1812.

7020. By what right was he admitted?—He got his freedom by special favour.

7021. Will you turn to the book, and see whether it is so?—It is not in the book, but I know it was so; it could have been in no other way.

7022. Why

7022. Why not?—He was not a resident; he did not live in Clonmel, in the town, and he was admitted in the batch of freemen that were made in 1812.
7023. Do you conceive that the claimants' rights, when those several freemen were admitted, were very accurately investigated in 1812?—No.
7024. Do you think that any person gave himself the slightest trouble as to whether Mr. Richard Moore was entitled?—I do not know.
7025. Did your father, who was then the town-clerk?—I do not think he did.
7026. Have you any other reason for concluding that he was made by special favour, except that you do not think he had any right?—I think it was by special favour that he was admitted.
7027. Is that your reason for thinking so?—I do not think he could claim it as eldest son, or by any other right; he did not serve his time.
7028. Is it because you see no right by which he could claim it, that you conclude that it was by special favour?—I believe he had no right that he could claim it by.
7029. Is it on that account that you conclude he was admitted by special favour?—I think it is; I think that having no right to demand it, he was admitted by special favour.
7030. Is that your only reason for believing that he was admitted by special favour?—It is.
7031. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Have you any knowledge on the subject at all, or are you giving anything more than your own surmise?—It is only my own surmise.
7032. Were you yourself present upon the occasion of any investigation or any vote as to the passing of those persons?—I was not; it was before my time.
7033. For aught you know, several of those persons who were admitted upon the same occasion with Mr. Moore, may have been admitted as of right?—They might for aught I know.
7034. And you do not know, if there were any claims by reason of right, what steps were taken to investigate those rights at the time?—I do not.
7035. Mr. O'Connell.] Can you, as an officer of the corporation, give the Committee any information upon the subject?—None that they can rely upon.
7036. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] So that the only record you have of the title by which any of those parties were admitted is your conjecture?—I cannot give you any other.
7037. *Cloisman.*] How many freemen appear upon the register of voters at this moment?—I believe at present there are between 80 and 100 alive.
7038. They have been admitted by all the barristers?—Yes; there were some of them rejected by Mr. Guthrie.
7039. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Did he admit any?—He did admit some.
7040. *Cloisman.*] What class of freemen were the appellants, to the number of 26, who were admitted by Baron Foster on appeal?—Persons who had not served some corporation office, they were rejected; persons that had served a corporation office, mayor or burgess, or anything of that kind, he admitted.
7041. Mr. O'Connell.] That was in the Irish Statute of Limitations of Corporations?—Very old freemen, he admitted some of them; others he did not.
7042. All those that were sworn before; the six years before?—No; he rejected some that were admitted in 1812.
7043. Had they been sworn in 1812?—There was no proof of their having been sworn.
7044. *Cloisman.*] What was the ground upon which Mr. Guthrie rejected those 26 that Baron Foster afterwards admitted?—I could not well state what the reasons were.
7045. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Was it one reason that affected all, or one reason affecting one, and another reason affecting another?—I think there was a good deal of his own choice; he rejected some and he admitted others, and the very same reason affected all, I think.
7046. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] What do you mean by his own choice?—He admitted me because I was town-clerk.
7047. That is to say, where he saw reasons for admission he admitted, and where he saw no reason for admission he rejected?—I think there was the same objection to everybody, if there was any.
7048. What was that objection?—A great deal of it was Mr. Guthrie's own fancy. I do not think he had any reason at all for it; he might have a

Mr. E. Lohrke.

27 April 1837.

reason in his own mind; but he said, "I will admit this person," and "I will not admit this person."

7049. If he had a reason in his own mind, can you say it was his own fancy?—I think it was very much his own fancy.

7050. He took a fancy to you, and admitted you?—Because I was town-clerk.

7051. And he took fancies to some others, because they held some other offices?—Some ancient ones he admitted.

7052. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Did he assign reasons for each admission, or did he only say "I admit this man," and "I reject that man"?—That was pretty much his course.

7053. Mr. O'Connell.] Are you aware that he was bound to give reasons for the rejection, in order to found an appeal?—He gave reasons, and he did not give reasons.

7054. Are you aware that he is bound to put in the book the reason of the rejection?—It was not taken in the book, I am sure.

7055. Are you aware that, in point of law, he was bound to do so?—No.

7056. Chairman.] Are you not aware that by the 21st section it is enacted, that the barrister shall state the objection by reason whereof the claimant is held not to be entitled to register?—There was a slip of paper upon which it was done in some instances, I know; I had to get him to state his objections, in order to go before the judge, for he sat up to the day at which the judge sat.

7057. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then, in point of fact, he did give his reasons?—He gave some written reasons why he had rejected.

7058. Mr. O'Connell.] What were those reasons?—I do not know.

7059. Were not you bound to keep them?—No; I wrote to the Solicitor-General to know what was my duty; he said I had nothing to do with it.

7060. Who was the Solicitor-General?—Mr. Crampton; I wrote to him by post, and he answered me.

7061. Chairman.] Did you write to him as the legal officer of Government?—I did; and he wrote to me to say I had nothing whatever to say to it.

7062. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Who, in fact, acted at the registry; was it the clerk of the peace?—Yes.

7063. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You were the attorney for the appellants?—I was.

7064. Chairman.] You stated, that up to the last moment of the judge coming upon the bench to decide the appeal cases, Mr. Guthrie continued registering?—He continued registering as long as people came to him, and, in fact, till the judge came into court; he had to go up to the hall-room to sit, after the court was prepared for the judge.

7065. How long was he engaged in registering in Clonmel?—I believe 14 days.

7066. In what month of the year was Mr. Guthrie registering?—I believe it was an adjourned assizes; the assize was postponed on account of the cholera.

7067. Were those appeals opposed by counsel as well as supported by counsel?—There were several counsel on both sides.

7068. Was the decision of the Irish House of Commons, in Mr. Bagwell's case, brought forward upon that occasion?—No.

7069. Does not it appear by the Journals that that decision was carried by a casting vote?—It does.

7070. Was opposition made before all the revising barristers, with regard to the admission of freemen?—There was opposition, decidedly.

7071. Who was the barrister who succeeded Mr. Guthrie?—Mr. Hobson, I believe, was the registering barrister for the county.

7072. And Mr. Howley followed him?—Yes.

7073. Were discussions raised before those two gentlemen as to the admission of freemen?—There were.

7074. Did those gentlemen admit the same description of freemen as were rejected by Mr. Guthrie?—They admitted some and rejected others.

7075. Did they admit any freemen coming under the class of freemen who were rejected by Mr. Guthrie?—There were new freemen.

7076. Did they admit the freemen about whom you gave evidence on the former day, whose indentures were not produced?—They did.

7077. Was that circumstance called to your recollection?—I was examined to it.

7078. That

7078. That circumstance did appear to them, but they still admitted them upon the register?—They did.

7079. Did they admit freemen all of whom had the objections made against them which had been raised by Mr. Serjeant Ball, during your examination?—They admitted persons when some objections were made to them.

7080. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you mean to say that all the objections I have been mentioning were made upon that occasion?—Not all the objections you have been making, but similar objections.

7081. Chairman.] Were similar objections made to the admission of freemen, and were those freemen, in spite of those objections, admitted by both Mr. Hobson and Mr. Howley?—They were rejected.

7082. Was the objection of non-residence brought before their notice?—I should think it was.

7083. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Were you present?—I was.

7084. Did you hear that objection made, and if so, in what instance?—An objection was made as to the distance, but the objection as to the persons being admitted not resident in the town was made decidedly.

7085. Do you mean that it was made in every instance?—I will not say in every instance, but I believe in most instances.

7086. Was the objection made of their not residing within the town at the time when they were admitted as freemen?—The objection of not residing within the limits of the Act of Parliament was made.

7087. Chairman.] Was the question of persons having been non-resident at the time of their admission to their freedom raised before those two barristers?—I should think it was.

7088. Have you any doubt of the fact?—They were admitted by the barristers.

7089. Was that question raised before the barristers?—I will not say that that exact question was raised before them, but they were admitted to their freedom, and they were registered accordingly.

7090. Was the question raised before the barristers as to persons not being resident, not having a right to be admitted as freemen of the borough of Clonmel?—I do not think that exact question was raised before the barristers.

7091. Was the question as to freemen, whose indentures were not produced, not having a right to the freedom, raised before the barristers?—I think it was.

7092. Which way did the barrister decide when that question was raised?—The barrister considered that the certificate of the admission was the proof he had of it.

7093. Was the certificate of admission supposed to be sufficient authority for him to place them upon the register?—I think it was sufficient.

7094. Has that opinion been fortified by any legal decision?—I do not remember the Chief Baron deciding that in Clonmel.

7095. Do you know the fact?—No, I do not know the fact.

7096. Mr. O'Connell.] You are an attorney?—Yes.

7097. But you do not practise in Dublin?—Not much.

7098. Chairman.] Was there evidence of servitude?—No, there was no evidence of servitude; it was before the council of the corporation they were admitted to their freedom.

7099. Was there any other evidence given before the barrister than the certificate?—I do not think there was.

7100. With regard to what you stated as to Quakers having objections to indentures, do you mean to say that it is never the custom among Quakers for an apprentice to be indentured?—The custom among the Quakers is an entry in the book without any indenture, as far as I know.

7101. Can you state that to be the practice in any other town besides Clonmel?—No, I cannot.

7102. You have said that the Municipal Commissioners entered into a good deal of examination during their stay at Clonmel?—They did.

7103. And they examined a great number of witnesses?—They did.

7104. And they have made a Report, which has been printed, and which you have seen?—I have never read it through; I have seen it.

7105. Do not they state that the choice of freemen is not restricted to residents or to any other class of persons?—They do state that.

Mr. E. Lebert.
27 April 1837.

7106. Do they not further state, "It seems now to be acknowledged that rights to the freedom of this corporation do exist by birth, service and marriage"?—They do.

7107. Are you aware that any distinction existed previous to the Reform Act as to the rights of freemen admitted under any of the different qualifications of which you have spoken?—I never knew a person admitted in right of marriage till the Reform Bill.

7108. Do you know whether there was any distinction between the rights of freemen who were admitted upon the roll of the corporation as to any of the advantages derived from their freedom; did not every person that was admitted upon the roll of freedom enjoy the same advantages?—They did.

7109. The same immunities and privileges in every way?—Certainly.

7110. Was it not the object before the Reform Bill to restrict the freemen as much as possible?—There were very few indeed.

7111. Was it desired to have as large a body of freemen, or as small a body as possible, before the Reform Bill?—There were very few made.

7112. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Are you acquainted what was the object of those who managed the corporation affairs, whether they were desirous of having a large constituency or a small one?—I should think they wished for a small one.

7113. Mr. O'Connell.] Do not you know that it was the private property of the Bagwell family?—I considered that it was.

7114. Chairman.] Was not it desired, on the part of the governing body of the corporation, to restrict as much as possible the right to be freemen?—They certainly did as much as possible.

7115. Therefore they had a desire to restrict the admission into this corporation of freemen by any right whatever?—They restricted, as much as possible, admissions into the corporation.

7116. Mr. O'Connell.] By any right?—By any right; for rights were not acknowledged before the Reform Bill. Persons claimed and did not get it, that I know; some had no right that claimed a right.

7117. In point of fact, the claim that they made was not allowed?—They were refused.

7118. Mr. Hamilton.] Have you known any instance in which proceedings were taken in a court of law to enforce the right of freedom?—I know no instance in which proceedings were taken.

7119. Chairman.] Did you ever hear of general rules for corporations under the 17th and 18th of Charles the Second?—No.

7120. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You have been asked whether the Commissioners do not state in their Report that it is now acknowledged that the right of freedom of this corporation does exist by birth, service and marriage; do you observe the language of the Report, "It seems now, however, to be acknowledged that rights to freedom in this corporation do exist by birth, service and marriage"?—Yes.

7121. Do you observe this also, that in the next paragraph the commissioners state, "No entry, however, of any admission in right of marriage is found on the corporation books before the Reform Act"?—Yes.

7122. Do you see this stated, "It is stated by members of the corporation that the eldest son only is entitled by birth; that a person becomes entitled, in right of servitude, by serving a regular apprenticeship to a freeman in the town; and that the right by marriage is acquired by being married to any daughter of a freeman"; do you observe that they give it not as their judgment, but as the statement of members of the corporation, and that they follow that by the following statement: "no entry, however, of any admission in right of marriage is found on the corporation books before the Reform Act"?—Yes.

7123. You were asked whether the Commissioners do not report that "the choice of freemen is not restricted to residents or to any other class of persons," and you stated that they do; now, are not the Commissioners there stating what is the practice, and not what in their opinion is the law?—They are.

7124. Do you find this paragraph in the Report: "It does not appear that persons had been admitted to their freedom on any claim of right for a length of time prior to the Reform Bill, probably not for 80 years"?—Yes.

7125. Do you find this passage in the Report: "The head or patron of the corporation seems formerly to have had sufficient influence to procure the admission

sion of any number of freemen be pleased, or the rejection of any individual be objected to, and this influence is still supposed to continue to a certain extent in the Bagwell family"?—Yes, I do.

7126. Do you find this passage: "It is in evidence that several of the old and respectable inhabitants of the town have not been admitted freemen, and that there are also respectable persons in trade who have not been admitted, and have in consequence been exposed to inconvenience and expenses which persons who are free do not suffer"?—Yes.

7127. Do you observe this passage in the Report: "It is in evidence that John Bagwell, esquire, of Marefield, during his life, and his son and grandson successively afterwards, were considered as the heads of this corporation, and that their recommendation and wishes were always attended to in the appointment of mayor, burgesses and the other officers of the corporation; that during the minority of the latter of these gentlemen the recommendation of his friends was attended to in like manner; and that the recommendation of the Bagwell family was equally influential in the return of Members of Parliament for the borough until the Reform Bill was passed. It is also in evidence, that the head of the corporation had sufficient influence to procure the admission of any number of freemen be pleased, and the rejection of any individual be objected to; and that his influence still continues in this latter respect"?—Yes.

7128. When you state that the certificate was deemed conclusive, do you apply that to the two barristers, Messrs. Hobson and Howley; is it not the fact, that Mr. Hobson, as well as Mr. Howley, deemed it their duty to take the certificate as conclusive of the right of the freeman?—I think that up to the last registry it was so: I think that Mr. Howley went further into evidence than the certificate at the last registry. He took evidence of Going having been the eldest son, his brother having been dead a great number of years; and the corporation did not know but that he was the eldest son born; whereas they showed that he had an elder brother who died some years ago.

7129. And that is the first instance of Mr. Howley not treating it as conclusive, and there is no instance of Mr. Hobson not treating the certificate as conclusive?—I think there is a case also by Mr. Hobson, in rejecting Dr. Bell's son, but Mr. Howley admitted him afterwards.

7130. But those are the only instances within your recollection in which the barristers did not consider that they were concluded by the certificate from going into the right to register?—I think they are the only two.

7131. Accordingly, if the assistant-barristers considered the certificate conclusive of the right of the freemen to register, it follows that they did not entertain, and they could not have entertained, any objection to the admission of the freemen?—No; they could not make any objection.

7132. Then if that be so, if the assistant barristers did not entertain the objections, and could not, for the reason you mention, is there any means by which the validity of the claim of the freemen can be investigated, except in the way in which it is now being investigated?—I am not aware of any.

7133. When freemen are admitted upon the production of the certificate, is there any redress against their admission, except by a committee?—No, I am not aware of any.

7134. *Chairman.*] You mean to say, that if his name once appears upon the Parliamentary Register, there is no way of getting it off, except through the medium of an Election Committee?—I believe not.

7135. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Did not the corporation, before the Reform Bill, admit as many freemen as it pleased to the freedom?—It did.

7136. Without requiring any qualification, and no matter where they resided or what trade they were of?—Yes.

7137. *Chairman.*] That was in accordance with their charter and their prescription?—It was at their will and pleasure.

Mr. Michael Glavin, called in; and further Examined.

7138-9. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] YOU were present in court upon the occasion of *Mr. Guthrie's* registry?—I was.

7140. You were the deputy-clerk of the peace at that time?—I was.

7141. Have you any recollection that persons who had given notice to register, and who came forward to claim, were rejected, upon the ground that the

Mr. E. Labarte.

27 April 1837.

Mr. M. Glavin.

Mr. M. Glavin.

27 April 1837.

premises were not of sufficient value; were there instances of that?—There were.

7142. Were there many instances?—From the lapse of time, I cannot recollect the particular instances; but I should think, as far as my recollection serves me, about 50.

7143. Rejected for insufficiency of value after investigation?—After investigation.

7144. Do you recollect the case of a person of the name of Patrick Barry, occupying a cellar?—I do.

7145. Do you recollect that that case was investigated by Mr. Guthrie?—I do.

7146. Do you recollect that one or two witnesses were examined to disprove the case attempted to be made out by Barry, and that particularly Mr. James Morgan was examined, to prove that the premises were not of sufficient value?—There was one witness examined to disprove it; and to the best of my recollection it was Mr. James Morgan.

7147. And upon the evidence on both sides, Mr. Guthrie came to the conclusion to reject the claim?—He did.

7148. It has been stated, that in some instances the claimants being asked whether their premises were of the value of 10*l.*, answered, "they are of the value of 10*l.* to me." Did you hear that said in any instance?—I did, in many instances.

7149. Is it in your recollection that Mr. Guthrie was in the habit of asking persons who made use of that form of words, whether they would sooner pay 10*l.* a year than give up the premises?—In some instances he asked them what they meant by saying "it is worth 10*l.* to me;" and the reply in general was, that they would sooner pay 10*l.* for it than go to look for another place.

7150. Those were cases, of course, in which, in point of fact, the rent was not 10*l.* a year?—All those were cases in which the rent was less than 10*l.* a year.

7151. And where the question was, what was the value of the premises?—Yes, I think it was in such cases.

7152. Is it in your recollection, that Mr. Guthrie not only investigated, in the way you have described, the meaning which the claimants put upon the words which they used, namely, "10*l.* value to me," but that he also was in the habit of calling upon the counsel or agent of the conservative party to know whether they had any witnesses to examine to disprove the case?—Yes, he did.

7153. As you were present during Mr. Guthrie's registry, have you any recollection of Mr. Guthrie's having stated anything to this effect, that he conceived the Reform Bill was intended to grant universal suffrage?—No; I think that one of the agents who were opposing the registry of a particular description of voters said, that it seemed by his construction that it was intended to give universal suffrage.

7154. Your recollection was, that that observation, that the bill was intended to give universal suffrage, instead of falling from Mr. Guthrie, was the expression which came from one of the agents employed by the conservative party?—Just so.

7155. And was applied, by the agent, to the conduct of Mr. Guthrie as registering barrister?—Yes.

7156. Did Mr. Guthrie state what, in his opinion, was the true construction of the Reform Bill with regard to the extension of the suffrage?—In many instances he took the Reform Bill and read the preamble of the Act.

7157. What did he state was his construction of the Act?—He said that in his opinion it should be construed in a liberal way.

7158. Did he state anything as to the claimant himself representing the value of his property?—Where the claimant was objected to, but not upon oath, he generally admitted the claimant; when a claim was rejected by any person, not in the adverse interest, and when the person would not swear that the premises out of which the claimant sought to be registered, were of less value than 10*l.*, he generally admitted the claimant from the claimant's own view, and on his own swearing of their being worth 10*l.* to him.

7159. When you say the claimant's own view, do you mean the claimant's judgment as to the value?—Yes.

7160. In those cases, where the party opposing the claim would not swear that the premises were, in the judgment of that party, not worth 10*l.* a year, you

you state that Mr. Guthrie was in the habit of admitting the claim; but do you mean to say that he did not investigate the claim made by the party himself, upon his own swearing?—He did.

7161. He was in the habit of asking him questions?—Yes.

7162. If he was satisfied by the answers of the claimant, and if nobody would come forward to swear that the premises were not worth 10*l.* a year, he was in the habit of admitting?—Yes.

7163. You state that to have been his general practice?—Yes.

7164. You know the premises which were occupied by persons of the name of Prendergast, Burke and Sullivan?—I do.

7165. Where were they situated?—In Bagwell-street.

7166. Those three persons, you are aware, registered out of the same house?—They registered out of the same house, but out of distinct sets of premises.

7167. Prendergast registered out of the shop?—With some other part of the house attached to it.

7168. Sullivan out of the cellars?—Yes.

7169. And Burke out of another part of the premises?—Out of the lodgings.

7170. The cellars had a distinct entrance, as usual?—Yes.

7171. Have you a recollection that Burke who registered as a lodger, his claim was investigated by Mr. Guthrie, and the objection of his being a lodger was considered by him?—There was an objection made to his being registered.

7172. Have you any recollection that there was evidence given by Burke that he had the exclusive use of the hall-door?—As far as my recollection serves me, Prendergast was examined upon the occasion.

7173. And he proved that Burke had the exclusive use of the hall-door?—He did.

7174. How did he himself get into the shop?—He had a shop-door in front of the street; the hall-door was in a lane.

7175. And Burke had the exclusive use of the hall-door?—He swore so, and the staircase was just immediately inside the hall-door.

7176. In point of fact both Prendergast and Burke have left the premises?—They have both since.

7177. So that Sullivan alone remains?—Yes; but there has been another person since registered out of the remainder of the house, except the cellar, a person of the name of Edward Cott.

7178. He is registered out of the entire premises, with the exception of the cellar?—Yes.

7179. Do you recollect a claim made by Mr. Burrows Close, an attorney, to register?—I do.

7180. He paid more than 20*l.* a year rent?—I do not know.

7181. He paid more than 10*l.* a year?—He must have paid more than 10*l.* a year rent, from the situation of his house.

7182. Do you recollect that he was objected to as a lodger?—Yes.

7183. And upon investigation the objection was allowed by Mr. Guthrie?—The objection was allowed, as he objected to swear that he was a householder.

7184. The objection being made that he was only a lodger?—Yes.

7185. And he refusing to swear that he was a householder?—When he read the affidavit, and was about subscribing to it, he wanted to have something introduced into the oath, when Mr. Guthrie said he could not do that, or allow any alteration in the form required by the Act.

7186. Do you recollect another instance of a claim before Mr. Guthrie by the Rev. Sackville Burke?—I do.

7187. He was a clergyman?—He was.

7188. It was proved that he was only a lodger with a Mr. James Burke?—He lodged with a Mr. James Burke.

7189. Mr. Sackville Burke is a conservative?—I do not know.

7190. Do you know who he voted for?—If he voted at all, I believe he voted for Mr. Bagwell.

7191. Did James Burke vote?—James Burke voted for Mr. Bagwell.

7192. Are they relations?—No.

7193. What became of the objection?—Mr. James Burke was examined; he claimed

Mr. M. O'Hara.

27 April 1837.

claimed as a householder, and it turned out that it was out of a stable that the Rev. Sackville Burke sought his franchise.

7194. Was it allowed?—It was.

7195. Does he remain upon the register?—He does not remain on the register, for he has left the town since.

7196. Do you know the cellar of a person named Thomas Shaughnessy, of Johnson-street?—I do.

7197. Do you know what rent he pays?—I believe about 9*l.* a year.

7198. Do you consider that 9*l.* a year is the full value of that cellar?—I rather think it would bring more.

7199. How much do you think it would bring?—I should say 10*l.*

7200. Do you know this cellar well?—I do; it is the cellar next to my own house.

7201. Do you know the occupier, Thomas Shaughnessy?—I do.

7202. Have you any particular reasons for being acquainted with the circumstances relating to the rent and the value of the cellar?—I have.

7203. Will you state what they are?—The person he holds from is a Mr. Achison, who lives next door to me. Mr. Achison is in trade; Shaughnessy has made some money there, and I believe he has, from time to time, lent him sums of money, and induced him to give it him upon those terms; and he, some short time ago, served him with a notice to quit unless he paid 10*l.* a year.

7204. What happened then?—He still continues in possession.

7205. Why is he allowed to continue in possession?—The time has not expired.

7206. These matters you state from your own knowledge?—Yes.

7207. They are your neighbours?—Mr. Achison is my next door neighbour, and the cellar is under that house.

7208. Is it your judgment that that cellar is worth 10*l.* a year?—It is; he follows the trade of a cooper; he has been there many years, and it is a good situation for his business.

7209. Do you know the premises of Messrs. Toole and Roche, in Dispensary-street?—I do.

7210. Will you attend to the following questions and answers, which have been given by a former witness: "What did you state the value of Patrick Toole's house to be?—Full 10*l.*, but twice voted for, by Roche and Toole. Are you quite clear upon that as to Roche?—Patrick Roche was the owner of the house. Are you quite sure he registered?—I am almost positive he did." Then afterwards, "Do you know how he voted?—I think he voted for Mr. Ronayne. You are quite certain of that?—Indeed, I am certain of it. And Toole also?—And Toole also." Now you observe the answers to those questions, that the house was twice voted for, by Roche and Toole, and that both Roche and Toole voted for Mr. Ronayne; can you state from your own knowledge whether the facts are as there stated or not? In the first place, did Roche vote at all at either of the elections?—No.

7211. Are you quite certain of that?—Quite certain.

7212. Did Toole vote at both the elections?—He voted but at one.

7213. Do you know the premises of Joshua Moore, in Johnson-street?—I do: he is a tenant to my father.

7214. Will you look at the valuation book of the town of Clonmel, and state what is the amount of the valuation of the house of Joshua Moore, in Johnson-street?—*£. 6.*

7215. Have you any reason to know that Joshua Moore occupied that house in 1828?—I know he did not.

7216. Do you know a person of the name of Thomas Delahunt?—I do.

7217. Have you the valuation of 1828?—I have not.

Mr. Patrick J. Keily, called in; and Examined.

Mr. P. J. Keily.

7218-19. *Chairman.*] WHAT are you?—I hold the situation of clerk to the commissioners for the watching and lighting of Clonmel.

7220. How long have you held that situation?—Since August 1831.

7221. Have you got the books of the valuation and the applotments?—I have [producing the same].

7222. Have

7222. Have you the book of 1828?—I have, and the valuations made in 1831 and 1834. [*The Witness delivered in the sense.*]
7223. Is the valuation of 1834 the last one?—It is.
7224. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Is that an entire valuation of the town, or a partial valuation?—A partial valuation.
7225. Is the valuation of 1831 an entire valuation or a partial valuation?—It is the valuation of new houses built, and of houses altered by way of improvements.
7226. But there is no general valuation since 1828?—No.
7227. Mr. *Serjeant Bull.*] Then the valuation of 1828 stands good now, so far as it is not contradicted by the subsequent valuations of 1831 and 1834?—Yes.
7228. What is the other book you have?—This book contains the whole valuation, from its adoption in 1828 to the present time inclusive.

Mr. P. J. Keily.

27 April 1837.

Mr. *Michael Glissan*, called in; and further Examined.

7229. WILL you turn to the valuation of 1828, to the premises occupied by Thomas Delahunt, in Lower Johnson-street; does Delahunt occupy those premises at present?—He does not.
7230. Who occupies those premises at present?—Joshua Moore.
7231. What is the valuation of those premises in the book in 1828?—£. 6.
7232. You state that Joshua Moore, who now occupies them, is tenant to your father?—He is, and so was Thomas Delahunt.
7233. Your father is the proprietor of the premises?—He is.
7234. What is the rent actually payable by Joshua Moore for those premises?—To the best of my recollection, his rent is over 13*l.* a year.
7235. You cannot state the precise sum?—I think it is somewhere about 18*l.*
7236. Do you know what rent was paid by Delahunt for those premises in 1828?—I should think something about 11*l.*
7237. Then how do you account for the rise in the rent from 1828 to the present time?—He got an additional apartment subsequent to 1828 from my father.
7238. But you state that the premises which were valued in that book at 6*l.*, actually paid at that time 11*l.* rent?—They did.
7239. Do you know the premises of Thomas Everard, in Johnson-street?—I do; it is next door to that just mentioned.
7240. Is your father the landlord of that?—He is.
7241. What is that house valued at in the books?—£. 6.
7242. That house is still occupied by Thomas Everard?—It is.
7243. Do you know the rent payable for that house at the present moment?—I should think it is between 11*l.* and 12*l.*
7244. Do you know the rent paid for that house in the year 1828, when the valuation took place?—I should think, between 10*l.* and 11*l.*
7245. So that that house, which is valued at 6*l.* in 1828 in the books, actually paid at the time between 10*l.* and 11*l.*?—It did.
7246. Mr. *Hamilton.*] You stated that the premises belong to your father, and you have stated that you think the rent is so much; how happens it that you do not know it?—I have drawn receipts for those persons, signed by my father, which makes me pretty certain that I am correct as to the amount.
7247. Does not the fact of your having drawn receipts enable you to be certain, and not merely to conjecture?—They have paid me the rents for my father.
7248. What have they paid you?—It may be a few shillings over or under, but not a *l.* in either case.
7249. Did they pay the rent regularly?—They did.
7250. Can you state what arrear is due up to this time?—I suppose the current half-year, and no more.
7251. Can you state whether the premises now occupied by Joshua Moore were the same in point of extent and description as the premises which you have stated were occupied by Delahunt, in 1828?—Before Delahunt left it he got an additional room from my father, which increased the rent, I think, about 30*s.* a year.
7252. Was the valuation made in reference to the premises before the ad-

Mr. M. Glissan.

ditional

Mr. M. Gillies.

27 April 1837.

ditional room was given, or subsequently?—I think the addition was given to them subsequent to the valuation.

7253. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But in point of fact, at the time of the valuation, he paid 10*l.* a year?—At least.

7254. Mr. Hamilton.] With respect to the house of Thomas Everard, is it precisely the same in point of extent and description as it was in 1828?—No, it is not; he got also an additional room: my father, who lived next door, left the house, and gave to each of them an additional room that he had.

7255. Does he pay more or less rent now than he did then?—He pays more rent now than he did in 1828.

7256. How much more?—I should think about 30*s.* a year.

7257. And in 1828 he paid 10*l.*?—*£*.10 at least.

7258. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you know the premises of William Hurley in Bagwell-street?—I do.

7259. Do you know the premises occupied by Robert Willis in Bagwell-street, in 1828?—The premises that were occupied by Willis in 1828, are now occupied by Hurley, a brushmaker.

7260. Did you know that house in 1828?—I did; I never was in the house.

7261. What is the value of the house in the books in 1828?—The valuation here is 7*l.*

7262. Do you happen to know the rent that William Hurley pays?—No.

7263. What would you say is the value of the house?—I cannot say; I never was in it; the house, as to outward appearance, is the same now that it was in 1828.

7264. Do you know what was the rent of it in 1828?—I do not know.

7265. Do you know the house of John Durney in Mary-street, that was occupied by John Daniel, a carpenter, in 1828?—Yes.

7266. What is the valuation of that house in the book?—*£*. 8.

7267. Do you know the value of that house?—I have been in the house frequently; Durney works for me as a tailor.

7268. Do you know what rent he pays?—No.

7269. Did you know the house in 1828?—I did.

7270. Is it, in your judgment, in as good a condition now as it was in 1828?—I think it is about the same. It was much improved in 1828 by John Daniel, and I think it is about much in the same condition now as it was then.

7271. Was the improvement made before or after the valuation?—Before.

7272. Mr. Hamilton.] You stated that Durney is your tailor; are you aware that there are two persons, Edward and John Durney, who occupy the house?—There are two persons registered in that house; there is Edward Durney and John Durney.

7273. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you know the house that was occupied by John Kennedy in 1828, in Mary-street?—Yes.

7274. Who occupies that house now?—I do not know exactly who occupies it at present.

7275. What is the valuation in 1828?—*£*. 8.

7276. Do you know that house at present?—I do.

7277. Does it appear to you to be in a better or worse or the same condition now as in 1828?—I have not been in the house, but it has the same appearance from the street.

7278. Do you know the house that was occupied in 1828 by Joseph Cochran, in Johnson-street?—I do; it is opposite where I live.

7279. Who occupies that house now?—William Maxey.

7280. What is the valuation of that house in the books?—*£*. 8. It was then occupied by Mr. Cochran, a veterinary surgeon.

7281. Did you know the house in 1828?—I did.

7282. Do you consider the house of the same value now that it was in 1828?—I do.

7283. You do not know the rent he pays?—No.

7284. Do you know the house that was occupied by John Brown, in Johnson-street, in 1828?—I do.

7285. What is the valuation put upon that house?—*£*. 10.

7286. Who is that house now occupied by?—His son, James Brown.

7287. Do you consider that house in as good condition now as it was in 1828?—I do.

7288. Do

7288. Do you know the house of widow Riley, in Bagwell-street?—I do.
7289. What valuation is put upon the house occupied by widow Riley in 1828?—£. 15.
7290. What state was that house in in 1828, as compared with its present condition?—In the same state. I have known the house nearly 20 years, and I have not seen any change in it.
7291. You do not know the rent of it?—No.
7292. Do you find in the valuation the house of Messrs. Matthew and James Butler, in Main-street?—Yes.
7293. Do you know who occupies that house at present?—I cannot say who occupies it.
7294. Do you know the house?—I know that they did occupy a house in Main-street about that place; it is either that house or the next.
7295. Do you know the house that was occupied in 1828 by James Maxey, in Johnson-street?—I do.
7296. What is the valuation of that house?—£. 10.
7297. Who occupies that house now?—His widow occupies one part.
7298. Who occupies the other part?—A person named Mokler.
7299. You knew that house in 1828, and you know it now?—Yes.
7300. Do you consider that it is in the same condition now as it was in 1828?—I rather think not; I think it is divided since 1828.
7301. Is it of as much value now in your judgment as it was in 1828?—It is.
7302. Can you state the rent paid for it?—No.
7303. Do you know that Mokler actually paid a fine on coming in?—I know that he paid half a year's rent on getting into possession.
7304. Did he pay that as a fine, or as an advance?—I think he paid it as a fine.
7305. What was the half-year's rent?—I think it was 6*l.*; I drew the receipt for Mrs. Maxey for Mokler, on Mokler's paying so much for her to the head landlord, or to his agent, on her account.
7306. Then if so, 12*l.* must be the yearly rent paid by Mokler?—So I think.
7307. And that for only part of the house?—Yes.
7308. Then the result is, that Mokler pays 12*l.* a year for part of the house; what is the valuation of the whole of the premises in 1828?—It appears by this book, 10*l.*
7309. Do you happen to know what was paid for it in 1828?—No.
7310. But your impression is, that the house is of much the same value now as it was in 1828?—As to outward appearance it is about the same; as to any inward alteration I am not aware.
7311. Mr. Hewitson.] But it has been converted into two?—I think it has.
7312. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you know the house of John Cardon, in Mary-street?—I do.
7313. Did he occupy it in 1828?—I do not suppose he did.
7314. Can you say who did?—I cannot.
7315. Do you know the house now occupied by James Sayers, in Upper Johnson-street?—I cannot say that I do.
7316. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] You are deputy clerk of the peace for the county of Tipperary?—I am.
7317. Who is your principal?—Thomas Sadleir.
7318. Do you hold any other employment from anybody?—No.
7319. You are not in the employment of any other person?—No.
7320. Have you any other occupation?—I am in the spirit and grocery trade.
7321. Wholesale or retail; do you sell glasses of whiskey?—Yes, at the counter.
7322. Mr. O'Connell.] Every person in the same line of trade is in the habit of selling whiskey?—Yes; even those that sell by wholesale have retail licences.
7323. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Are you a wholesale dealer?—No.
7324. Have you licences to sell by retail?—Yes.
7325. You are what is sometimes called in politics a "radical"?—I do not know.
7326. What do you think?—I believe that may be applied to me.
7327. Do not you think you are entitled to it; are not you a very good radical?—

Mr. M. Gillies.

27 April 1837.

radical?—I do not know exactly what is meant by the word "radical"; there are so many definitions given of the word "radical."

7328. What is your definition of it?—A man that wishes well to his country; if that is the meaning of it, I am a radical.

7329. What is your meaning of it?—In the literal sense of the word, perhaps, I do not know.

7330. Have you any idea of your own as to what "radical" means?—A radical is a man that would wish to see good laws and cheap governments.

7331. Anything else?—The abolition of tithes.

7332. Anything else?—And municipal reform.

7333. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Is that all?—Nothing more particular.

7334. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson*.] In that sense you are a radical?—Yes.

7335. And a zealous one?—No, not very zealous; I never mix much in politics.

7336. Do you render any assistance to the cause in your county?—I do not know that I do, except that I give my vote for my friends.

7337. Did you ever render them a good turn in preparing notices for them for the registry?—I do, for both sides, if they ask me to do so, and have frequently done so.

7338. Do you give information at all to the press respecting the progress of the registries?—No.

7339. What are the newspapers in your county?—There are, I believe, four newspapers published in Clonmel.

7340. Do you know the paper called the Free Press?—Yes.

7341. Have you any communication with that newspaper touching the registries?—Never.

7342. Do you know Mr. Cahill?—Yes.

7343. Is he connected with the Free Press?—Not that I know.

7344. Who is he, or what is he?—He is an attorney, practising in the county of Tipperary.

7345. Who is the person that is connected with the Free Press; is it Mr. Hackett?—He is the proprietor, I believe.

7346. Do you communicate with Mr. Hackett at all upon the subject of the registries?—No.

7347. And never did?—No.

7348. You never communicated any information through Mr. Cahill, or for him?—No.

7349. Do you communicate the results of the day's registries to Mr. Hackett?—I do not.

7350. Did you never do it?—I never did.

7351. You undertake to say that you never wrote to Mr. Hackett, giving him the number of the registries?—If I was out at sessions at a distant part of the county, I would generally do that for one newspaper as well as another.

7352. Have you done it for Mr. Hackett?—I do not recollect that I have; I have written communications so far as concerns the registry, but to what particular paper I have given them I do not recollect, but generally to the Advertiser.

7353. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] What politics is the Advertiser?—They are what is called conservative.

7354. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson*.] Does Mr. Cahill, the deputy Crown solicitor, act for the radicals?—He does, at the registries.

7355. Have you any connexion with Mr. Cahill at all?—Not the least.

7356. Are you always at the registries yourself?—No.

7357. Does your principal attend?—He does attend at the registries.

7358. Then you did not attend at all the sittings of Mr. Guthrie?—Except about half the first day's proceedings.

7359. Then you cannot tell what Mr. Guthrie said or did on the first day of the proceedings?—No.

7360. You do not undertake to say that Mr. Guthrie did not use the language that you were asked about?—I will not undertake to say any such thing.

7361. Mr. Guthrie may have said, on that day, that the object of the Reform Bill was to give universal suffrage?—He may.

7362. Do you mean to say that he could not have said it upon any other day without your hearing it?—He could not.

7363. You say that you heard every word that Mr. Guthrie uttered during the whole time that he sat as registering barrister, except the first half day?—I do not say I heard every word he said, but that so far as he gave opinions upon the questions I heard his opinions.

7364. Do you mean to say that you heard every sentence that he uttered publicly in court every day except the first?—To the best of my recollection, I heard every word; I was immediately under him.

7365. You do not mean to convey that it is not possible but that he might have said that upon any one of the days without your having heard him.—He did not say it in an open way, that might have been heard generally.

7366. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you mean to say that he could not have said it, that the agents on both sides, and the public in general, should hear it?—Certainly, he could not.

7367. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Did you hold conversations during any of those days with any person in court upon that subject?—I do not suppose I did.

7368. Will you state that you did not?—I held conversations so far, as that some men asked me to write their names for them, that were marksmen.

7369. Did not a great many persons apply to you to fill up certificates for them?—Not to fill up certificates; they had them all prepared.

7370. But to write their names for them, and various other things?—Yes, I did that, under the direction of the court.

7371. Do you mean to say that your attention could not have been drawn away for a single moment during the whole of the sittings of Mr. Guthrie during those sessions?—My attention was not called away so far as that such a thing could have occurred without my hearing it.

7372. How many days did he sit?—I believe about seven or seven and a half.

7373. And during the whole seven and a half days you say you held no conversation with any persons, and did not suffer your attention to be diverted from Mr. Guthrie for a single moment?—No, I did not. While there was one person's affidavit under consideration, there never was a second called on till that one was completed, because while I was attending the person, putting down his name, or subscribing his mark, I had to call from the list, and till I was done with him I did not call for the next name from the list.

7374. The question is as to your attention being taken up with persons speaking to you whilst you were in court, which is a thing that happens to every officer of the court; do you live in the town of Clonmel?—I do.

7375. Have you many acquaintances in Clonmel?—Yes.

7376. You are in the public business?—Yes; but I am not in the business myself.

7377. And being deputy clerk of the peace, you must have had many acquaintances at the court; and you must be a very extraordinary clerk of the peace, if, while you were sitting in court, a great many people did not come and trouble you with questions and conversation?—They did not.

7378. Are you prepared to state that during those seven and a half days your attention was never withdrawn from Mr. Guthrie for a single moment?—Not to such an extent that such language could have been used in the hearing of the court and I not have heard it.

7379. Then you think it is impossible that those words could have been used during those seven days and a half?—That is my impression.

7380. The question is, whether you can state positively that such a thing could not have occurred?—It is near five years ago, and so far as my recollection of anything else that occurred, and my own opinion and feelings about it enable me to speak with certainty, I should say that no such thing could have occurred without my hearing it.

7381. Then all you say is, that the thing being five years ago, you, exercising the best recollection you can upon it, your opinion is, that no such words were used?—Yes.

7382. But you will not undertake to go the full length of saying, to a positive certainty, that no such words were used?—I will.

Mr. M. Gillson.

27 April 1837.

7383. Mr. O'Connell.] Have not you as good a right to rely upon the accuracy of your memory at the end of five years as any body else?—I have.
7384. Mr. Serjeant Jarkess.] Do you think memory applies negatively as strongly as positively? May not a thing occur, and a man not have heard it, or forget it, and is not that much more likely than that a man should be mistaken who speaks to his having positively heard the thing?—The thing was talked of as having occurred immediately after the registry, and my opinion then, and my opinion now, is, that no such thing did occur.
7385. Then it was alleged even immediately after the registry?—It was.
7386. Generally spoken of in the town?—Not generally.
7387. Did you hear it spoken of by more than one person?—I did, by some persons who were acting as the friends of Mr. Bagwell in opposing the registry of certain individuals.
7388. They stated it immediately after the registry?—Not immediately after.
7389. How soon after?—Between the registry and the time of Mr. Bagwell's petition, as far as my recollection serves me.
7390. What interval was there?—I suppose, about four months.
7391. Then within four months after the registry, these persons alleged it?—I heard it.
7392. To whom did they state it?—I believe the first I ever heard of it was, if my recollection does not mistake, in reading Mr. Bagwell's petition.
7393. Was that alleged in the petition?—To the best of my recollection, it was.
7394. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Were you summoned upon that petition?—I was summoned over merely as to the delivery of the poll-books to my possession.
7395. Were you present during the examination of any witnesses?—No.
7396. You state that you yourself recollect to have heard one of the agents of Mr. Bagwell state, in the way of commentary upon the proceedings of Mr. Guthrie, that if he went on at that rate he would establish universal suffrage, or something to that effect?—Yes.
7397. Does that circumstance lead you at all to conclude that you are right in your recollection that the language imputed to Mr. Guthrie, with respect to universal suffrage, was not used by him, but that a mistake may have occurred in this way, that the persons that said that Mr. Guthrie used those words may have alluded to what was said by the agents of Mr. Bagwell, and not by Mr. Guthrie?—It does, in some measure.
7398. You were asked whether you could state positively that Mr. Guthrie did not use the words during the first half day, when you were not present; if he had used such words, have you any doubt that you would have heard it made matter of observation and commentary immediately afterwards?—I am almost convinced that I would have heard it.
7399. Party spirit ran very high at this time in Clonmel?—Unfortunately it did.
7400. A petition was preparing against the return of Mr. Ronayne?—That I do not know, except that a petition was presented.
7401. And the adherents of Mr. Bagwell were a good deal excited?—There was a good deal of excitement on both sides.
7402. Therefore it was not very surprising that in a state of excitement some of the adherents of Mr. Bagwell, who, you say, imputed to Mr. Guthrie some of those expressions, should have gone further in imputing misconduct to the registering harrister than they would done if they had been perfectly collected upon the subject?—No, not in the least surprising.

Lancet, 1^o die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Lord Granville Somerset.		Mr. O'Connell.
Mr. Hamilton.		Mr. Morgan John O'Connell.
Sir Robert Ferguson.		Mr. Scjeant Jackson.
Mr. E. Tennent.		Mr. Letroy.
Mr. Serjeant Ball.		

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Michael Glisson*, called in ; and further Examined.

7403. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] DO you know the house of John Carden of Mary-street?—I do.

7404. Did you know it in the year 1828?—I did.

7405. Will you turn to the book and see what it was valued at in 1828 ; was it occupied by the same person then?—No, it was not.

7406. Who occupied it in 1828?—I believe a person of the name of Savage.

7407. Now what was the valuation of that house in 1828 ; what was it set down at?—£.8.

7408. Do you know, in point of fact, what rent Carden, the present tenant, pays for the house?—I do not.

7409. What do you consider the value of the house at present?—I could not take on myself to say ; I have never been in the house.

7410. Do you know Michael Power's house in Mary-street ; it is described as in the same line as the former one, and was occupied by a person of the name of John Kennedy in 1828 ; do you know that house?—Yes.

7411. Did I examine you before as to the house of James Sayers?—You did not.

7412. Are you quite sure I did not?—To the best of my recollection you did not ; I do not recollect that you did ; that is in Johnson-street ; I will look at Johnson-street.

7413. Well, did you know that house in 1828?—I did.

7414. Now do you consider it as valuable now as it was in 1828?—I do.

7415. Now will you look to the book and see what it was valued at in 1828 ; I believe it was held in 1828 by a person of the name of Kelly, either Thomas or William Kelly?—I do not see it in this book.

7416. Upper Johnson-street?—By this book it seems to be only Johnson-street generally ; I do not see Upper Johnson-street in it.

7417. Then you do not find any house either in James Sayers' or Thomas Kelly's name in 1828?—I do not see it here.

7418. Now you know there is a row of houses in Mary-street, is there not ; you know Mary-street?—I do, well.

7419. You told me that you know the houses of John Carden and Michael Power?—Yes.

7420. I believe they join each other?—Yes.

7421. And they are two of a row of houses, are they, in that street?—They are.

7422. Now be so good as look to the book and see ; you told me the valuation in the book was 8*l.*, I think, of both ; is it not so?—Yes.

7423. Now do you find other houses in that row valued in the same way, at 8*l.*?—I do.

7424. You knew those houses, you have already told me, in 1828?—I did.

7425. Do you consider them of the same value now as they were in 1828?—They are, to all appearances.

Mr. M. Glisson.

1 May 1837.

Mr. M. Glasse.

7426. You do not know anything of the rent paid by the tenants of either of those houses?—I do not.

1 May 1837.

7427. Nor can you undertake to state what the value is at present, or what it was in 1828; but you consider them of the same value now as they were then, as I understand you?—I do.

7428. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Can you speak with any degree of positiveness or precision with respect to the value of these houses?—No, except from their appearance: in 1828 they seemed to have the same appearance as they have at present.

7429. What is your knowledge of their value in 1828?—

Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] He can only say they appear to be of the same value now as they were then; he cannot say anything more than that.

7430. On a former day, I think the first day you were examined, you stated it was your impression that the assisting barrister was authorized by the Reform Act to revise the register annually; did you not state that, or something to that effect?—Yes, that was my impression.

7431. Have you since considered whether that is the case or not?—I have read over the section of the Reform Act.

7432. What is your impression at present, after reading the section?—Not knowing the law point, I am not sure whether it is part of his duty or not; there is a section in the Reform Act which I have here—

7433. Which you then considered as authorizing the assisting barrister to revise the list?—Yes.

7434. You say you cannot say now whether it is so or not?—No; but my reading of the section was that it was so at the time.

7435. Now, with regard to Mr. Guthrie's registry; I think you told us the last day you were examined, you attended in court during the entire time Mr. Guthrie was employed in registering except about half the first day, is not that so?—Yes.

7436. Well then, of course you can speak as to the general practice of Mr. Guthrie; from what occurred in your presence with reference to the admission or rejection of claimants, you can state generally what his practice was, cannot you?—His practice was: I had the sheet before me of the applicants' names, and I called the number and the name; the person attended, and I handed up his notice to the court.

7437. But what I want to know is this, to come to the point, are you aware it has been stated that Mr. Guthrie was in the habit of admitting claimants to register, who swore that their premises were worth 10*l.* to them, upon their oath alone, and in opposition to other evidence to the effect that the premises were not worth 10*l.*; are you aware that that has been stated?—No, I am not.

7438. Have you ever heard that stated of Mr. Guthrie, or imputed to him?—I heard at the time of the Petition that such things were imputed to Mr. Guthrie in his registry.

7439. Now I want to know from you; perhaps I had better take particular instances; do you remember the claim of Jeremy Crenin, basket maker?—I do.

7440. Do you remember whether he was rejected or admitted?—He was rejected.

7441. Do you remember whether any witness or witnesses were examined against his claim?—There was one.

7442. What was his name?—Mr. Douglas.

7443. Who is Mr. Douglas?—He is Mr. Bagwell's agent.

7444. Well, what was the purport of his evidence?—That the house was not of the value of 10*l.*

7445. And what was the purport of the evidence of Crenin himself, the claimant?—Why a great number of persons did serve notices who had no just claims, I think, to their franchise, and he among the rest attended and thought he could be registered, I suppose.

7446. Did you hear him give evidence?—Yes, Crenin stated it was worth to him 10*l.*

7447. Did the barrister, Mr. Guthrie, question Crenin as to what he meant to say by its being worth to him 10*l.*?—He did.

7448. He sifted it?—He did.

7449. And

7449. And he heard the evidence of Douglas, the agent of Mr. Bagwell?—Yes, and Crenin, I believe, was the tenant of Mr. Bagwell.

7450. And notwithstanding Crenin's statement that the premises were worth 10*l.* to him, upon the evidence of Mr. Bagwell's agent, Mr. Guthrie rejected the claim?—He did.

7451. Now do you recollect any other instance in which, notwithstanding the claimant stated that the premises were worth 10*l.* to him, Mr. Guthrie rejected the claim, either upon examining the claimant himself, or upon the evidence of third persons, or upon both?—I could not particularize instances, but I know there were a great many that were rejected upon cross-examination by Mr. Guthrie, of the parties seeking to be registered themselves.

7452. Mr. *Hamilton.*] In that case of Crenin did the barrister assign any reason for his rejection?—He assigned that he was fully agreed with Mr. Douglas, that the place was not worth 10*l.* to any man who wished to take the place, and to pay 10*l.* rent for it.

7453. Then was it on the principle that it was not worth 10*l.* to Crenin that he rejected him?—It was on the ground that it was not worth 10*l.* either to him or to anybody; that is the way I took it.

7454. *Chairman.*] Did Mr. Douglas state the rent that was paid by Crenin?—I do not know whether he stated the rent; I think he stated it might be worth 3*l.* or 4*l.* a year.

7455. Mr. *Hamilton.*] So that in point of fact Mr. Guthrie disbelieved the claimant?—He did.

7456. *Chairman.*] What was Crenin's house: entered at in the corporation books?—I do not think it was valued at all, from the position it stands in the town; it was in a remote part of the town; I do not think the valuation extended so far at all; it is a small thatched cabin which stands at the extremity of Irishtown.

7457. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson.*] This was very grossly under value?—In my mind it was.

7458. Are you acquainted with it?—I am.

7459. A small thatched cabin?—Yes; with a few ridges of ground at the back.

7460. Then it was grossly and palpably under value, according to your judgment?—Yes.

7461. Mr. *Hamilton.*] What value should you set on it?—I should think at the outside it was not worth more than 5*l.* a year; I do not think it was.

7462. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] Do you know a person of the name of John Hennessy, of Hopkins-hall?—I do.

7463. Now in the evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins, No. 2807, I find this question and answer: "Do you know John Hennessy?—He lives in Hopkins-hall; several of those persons that I have named have not voted upon any particular side, they have voted for both sides; but I have determined not to make any distinction between parties. John Hennessy and several of the others have voted for both sides." You hear that?—I do.

7464. Do you know whether this be the fact or not, that John Hennessy voted for both sides?—He positively did not.

7465. *Chairman.*] Which side did he vote for?—He voted twice for Mr. Bagwell.

7466. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] Now in the evidence of the same witness (Joseph Higgins), I find these questions and answers, No. 2814, 2815, 2816 and 2817, the witness was asked "What rent did Flanagan admit that he paid for his lodging?—He told me that he paid 1*s.* 2*d.* a week. I will state the circumstances under which he mentioned that to me: when I received the summons to attend at the registry to give evidence as to the value of places, in the year 1832, there was one valuator who thought it would be proper again to look at those places from which persons had served notices of their intention to register, and we went into the lane. I met a person, and I asked, 'Where does John Flanagan live?' John Flanagan and James Flanagan both had served notices to register; I asked, 'Where does John Flanagan live?' He said, 'He lives up stairs in that house,' pointing to the house. I said, 'Where does James Flanagan live?' 'I am James Flanagan,' said he, 'and I am brother to John; we both live together.' I asked what rent he paid, he said, they paid 1*s.* 2*d.* a week. One only was registered." "Were you present in court during

Mr.
Michael Gilmore.

1 May 1837.

his registering?—I was." "Do you remember whether those circumstances were stated in court?—The circumstance was elicited by cross-examination, that he paid but 1 s. 2 d. a week." "So far as your recollection serves you, were there not many cases of persons that were lodgers registered by Mr. Guthrie?—I believe there were several." Now you have heard those questions and answers, now will you tell me whether, in point of fact, it is true that Mr. Guthrie registered many persons, that there were several cases of persons who were lodgers, registered by Mr. Guthrie. When I say lodgers, I mean persons who occupied only part of a dwelling-house, and had no exclusive use of the entrance or of the approach to that part; can you tell me whether there were several of such cases registered before Mr. Guthrie, where the evidence was that the parties were mere lodgers, not having the exclusive use of the approach, or of the entrance to the lodging or to the part they occupied?—Not any to my belief; unless they swore that they were the owners of the house, the tenants or owners of the house out of which they sought to register, they were not admitted; and in any case where they admitted they were only lodgers in a house, they were uniformly refused by Mr. Guthrie to be registered.

7467. Do you mean to state that in any case where they admitted they occupied only part of the premises, and that they had not the exclusive use of the door or entrance to that part, that in any one case where that appeared before Mr. Guthrie, he rejected the claim?—I do.

7468. Then if, in point of fact, any person was registered who occupied only a part of the premises, to which he had not the exclusive use of the entrance, if that did, in point of fact, appear, do I understand you to say that it did not appear so in evidence before Mr. Guthrie?—Yes.

7469. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Were you the officer that always attended the registry with Mr. Guthrie?—I was.

7470. No other person?—No other person.

7471. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now you heard in this evidence I have been reading to you something said about Flanagan's paying 1 s. 2 d. a week; in the case of these Flanagans,—do you know, in point of fact, in Clonmel it is not uncommon for yearly tenants to pay their rents weekly?—It is the general custom with people of that description, who hold by the year, to pay their rents weekly; being tradesmen, the landlords do not like to let it run.

7472. And that is the general practice with persons of that description, tradesmen?—It is; I know Flanagan's premises particularly well.

7473. How came you to know his particularly well?—He is a printer by profession, and I had occasion to go to his place and saw a portion of the house; the division was long subsequent to the registry; my going to his house was long after the registry of Mr. Guthrie, and I saw distinctly he was not the owner of the house out of which he registered; that there was another family in the house.

7474. But this all appeared, you say, long after the registry?—Long after.

7475. And, of course, it did not appear in evidence before Mr. Guthrie?—No.

7476. Mr. O'Connell.] Then he was guilty of perjury?—I do not like to call it perjury.

7477. He had sworn falsely?—In my opinion he did, swearing he was the tenant or owner of a house which he was not.

7478. He swore falsely upon a matter within his own knowledge, and you do not like to call that perjury?—I know it is what I call perjury.

7479. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And he was not contradicted?—He was not.

7480. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Had you any antecedent knowledge of the man?—Not the least; I do not think I knew him even personally at the registry.

7481. You had no knowledge of him at the time?—I had no knowledge of him at the time, till, I suppose, two years after.

7482. Was there any person there investigating the matter at the time before Mr. Guthrie?—

Mr. Serjeant Ball.] That has appeared already in evidence.

7483. I want to know, with reference to this particular case, whether in this particular case there was a counsel acting upon that occasion, investigating this particular claim?—I could not charge my recollection as to that particular case.

Counselor

Counsellor Welch was there, but whether he opposed him or not I do not know.

7484. Have you a distinct recollection of this man Flanagan coming forward?—I have a distinct recollection that he did come forward, but what particular day or time during the registry I cannot say; it must have been the early part of the registry.

7485. You have a distinct recollection of that particular case, have you?—No, I cannot say I have.

7486. Then how can you say whether or not it appeared on the investigation of the claim that he had the exclusive occupation of the house?—I take it on myself to say so, from Mr. Guthrie's general conduct on the entire registry.

7487. Then your answers in this respect are derived from the inference you have drawn from Mr. Guthrie's general conduct, and not from anything that occurred in the investigation of this particular case?—Just so.

7488. Now if you have no particular recollection of what took place on the registry of this Flanagan, can you undertake to negative positively that it appeared upon his examination there was another person in the occupation of the house?—I am quite satisfied that no such thing did appear at the time of the registry.

7489. How can you have such a distinct recollection of that if you have no distinct recollection of the case being on at all?—From the number of notices there were 1,015 notices.

7490. That renders it, as it appears to me, less likely that you should have a recollection of that individual case?—Of that individual case, I cannot say have any particular knowledge of the individual case.

7491. Then your evidence is bottomed on the opinion you formed as to Mr. Guthrie's general correctness of conduct upon the occasion?—Yes, and that they were generally cross-examined by Counsellor Welch.

7492. Mr. O'Connell.] Is it this, that from the manner in which Mr. Guthrie proceeded, you would not allow him to register unless it appeared to him that he was the owner or tenant of the house?—That was my understanding.

7493. You have no recollection of the particular case?—No, I have not.

7494. Have you a recollection that Mr. Guthrie did not admit any but a person who upon the evidence before him, whether true or false, appeared to him to be the owner or tenant?—Yes, that is my impression.

7495. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] In consequence of the question Mr. Serjeant Jackson put to you, I beg to call your attention to this question and answer again, because you find that the witness, Joseph Higgins himself, does not state that the fact appeared in evidence that Flanagan was only a lodger; he does not say it appeared in evidence, he only says the fact was so, tallying precisely with this witness; the question is, "What rent did Flanagan admit that he paid for his lodging?—He told me that he paid 1s. 2d. a week. I will state the circumstances under which he mentioned that to me: when I received the summons to attend at the registry to give evidence as to the value of places in the year 1832, there was one valuator who thought it would be proper again to look at those places from which persons had served notices of their intention to register, and we went into this lane. I met a person, and I asked, 'Where does John Flanagan live?' John Flanagan and James Flanagan had both served notices to register; I asked, 'Where does John Flanagan live?' He said, 'He lives up stairs in that house;' pointing to the house. I said, 'Where does James Flanagan live?' 'I am James Flanagan,' said he, 'and I am brother to John; we both live together.' I asked what rent he paid; he said they paid 1s. 2d. a week. One only was registered." "Were you present in court during his registering?—I was." "Do you remember whether those circumstances were stated in court?—The circumstance was elicited by cross-examination, that he paid but 1s. 2d. a week." But he does not say the circumstance occurred that Flanagan was only a lodger. Now, after hearing that, do you find there, in his evidence, any statement that Flanagan was only a lodger?—Certainly not.

7496. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Give me leave to ask you, did I understand you to say that the course of business in Clonmel is, that the people who take premises by the year, instead of paying their rent half-yearly as is usual in other places, they pay their rent weekly?—Tradesmen and Labourers generally pay by

Mr.
Michael Glisson.

1 May 1837.

the week when they take small places; the landlord does not choose to let the rent run on to the end of six months.

7497. But do I understand you to say that in this place, where tradesmen, as you say, generally pay weekly, they take their tenements by the year as yearly tenants; do you state that to be the usual custom in Clonmel?—Some I know take only by the week, some take by the year.

7498. Now what proportion of them who pay weekly, take by the year?—A good many I should think.

7499. How many do you know now to be in that predicament?—I could not charge my memory with the population.

7500. Do you know 10 men in Clonmel who hold premises by the year at a yearly rent, which rent they nevertheless pay weekly?—I dare say I do know 10.

7501. Could you name 10?—I do not know that I could immediately.

7502. Could you name five?—No; I am not so conversant with that class of people.

7503. Could you name me three?—I do not know that I could.

7504. Could you name me two?—No.

7505. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Your attention was not called to this circumstance before you came to give your evidence?—No, never.

7506. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Now not being able to name to me two individuals in that situation, how came it to pass that you stated it to be the usual custom in Clonmel for people who are yearly tenants to pay their rent by the week?—I have heard from different persons that that is the usual way of people paying.

7507. Now, for example, who told you so?—I could not charge my recollection.

7508. Can you tell me any one person that ever told you that is the usual custom in Clonmel?—Indeed I cannot.

7509. Can you name one man now who, in point of fact, does hold his tenement as a yearly tenant, and who pays his rent weekly?—No; my avocations in life are such that I do not have any intercourse with people of that class.

7510. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] When you say you were told, do you mean you heard the thing talked of?—Yes; just as any other matter would occur upon the town.

7511. And your attention was not called to the person who said it, I presume, because you did not consider it a matter of any great importance?—I never thought of it after.

7512. But you have a general impression that the fact is so?—Yes.

7513. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Could you tell me anybody with whom you had such a conversation?—I could not.

7514. Could you tell me anybody that was by when such conversation was held?—No.

7515. Chairman.] Could you mention the time when any conversation of that sort was held?—It may have occurred at different times; I could not charge my mind with a recollection of what particular time it occurred.

7516. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Could you tell me the place where it occurred?—In the town; but the particular place I could not say.

7517. Could you tell me what place it was?—I could not.

7518. In any particular house?—No.

7519. Could you tell me under what circumstances it was; what led to it?—I could not; it was a mere casual conversation.

7520. Can you say how long ago it is since you heard it?—I do not suppose it has been for the last six months.

7521. But was it the last six months?—I think not.

7522. Was it the last twelve months?—I think not.

7523. Was it the last two years?—I could not fix on any particular time, but I think if it were within six or twelve months I should have recollected the persons or the circumstances.

7524. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now do you remember the cases of Prendergast, Burke and Sullivan, in Bagwell-street; I think I examined you as to these the last day; now with reference to what I have been just inquiring of you as to Mr. Guthrie's practice when persons came up who did not appear to occupy the entire of the premises, do you recollect Burke, one of those three persons, coming to register?—I do.

7525. Do you recollect whether he stated that he had the exclusive use of the entrance to that part of the house which he occupied?—He did.
7526. You recollect that distinctly?—Distinctly.
7527. And although he occupied only a part of the premises as a lodger, he stated he had the exclusive use of the entrance or hall door?—He did.
7528. Do you know Patrick Burke's house in Dispensary-street?—No, I do not.
7529. Do you know Laurence Cashin's house in Johnson-street?—I do.
7530. Now did he occupy that house in 1828?—No, he did not.
7531. Who did?—I believe it was a person of the name of Malone, was it not? James Malone.
7532. Do you know the value of those premises at present?—I do not know the value of them at present.
7533. Did you know the house in 1828?—I did.
7534. Do you consider the value of the house in 1828 was more or less than it is at present; does the house appear to have undergone any alteration since the year 1828?—The house seems to be about the same as it was in 1828.
7535. Will you look to the book and tell me what was the valuation of that house in 1828 [*the Witness referred to the book*]?—I do not see it here.
7536. Under the name of Malone?—I do not find it in this book; it is in Upper Johnson-street; but I do not see it in this sheet of reference.
7537. Is it an omission in the book; perhaps you had better turn to the subsequent valuation of 1831?—[*The Witness did so, but could not find it.*]

Mr. Patrick J. Keily, called in; and further Examined.

7538. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] DO you find the valuation of the house of Laurence Cashin, in the book of 1828, either under the name of Laurence Cashin or under the name of Malone of Johnson-street?—It is in Upper Johnson-street, under the name of James Malone, in 1828.
7539. Mr. Serjeant Ball, to Mr. Glissan.] Do you see now the house of Laurence Cashin in the valuation of 1828?—Yes, I see it under the name of James Malone.
7540. He was at that time the tenant?—He was.
7541. What was the valuation of that house in that book of 1828?—£. 12.
7542. Mr. Serjeant Ball, to Mr. Keily.] Now will you take the book of 1837?—That contains the whole valuation up to the present time inclusive.
7543. Do you see the same house there, the valuation of it at the present day?—I see the name of Mat Cashin; it should be Laurence Cashin.
7544. Mr. Serjeant Ball, to Mr. Glissan.] Is that the house of Laurence Cashin?—From the situation it is placed in the list, I know it is the same house.
7545. You know it is the same house?—I know it is the same house.
7546. Mr. Serjeant Ball, to Mr. Keily.] How came the name of Mat Cashin to be there instead of Laurence Cashin?—The collector may have taken down a wrong name, or may have been misinformed; but I have no doubt, as far as my knowledge goes, that is the same house.
7547. What is the valuation at the present time?—£. 12.
7548. Chairmen.] Look to the 28th October 1833; the valuation of it at that period?—It is not in that valuation.
7549. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Why does not it appear in the other?—It appears in this book, which contains the whole valuation, from its adoption in 1828 to the present time, inclusive.
7550. But what is contained in this valuation of 1831 and 1834?—Houses that were built in the meantime, or changed by way of improvements, all of which are comprised in this book.
7551. Do I understand you to say the only houses introduced into the valuation of 1831 and 1834, are either houses built since 1828, or houses that were standing in 1828, and which afterwards were altered or fell into decay, the valuations of which were altered in the meantime?—Yes; the valuations made in 1831 and 1834 are comprised of houses built since 1828, and of houses altered by way of improvement.
7552. But the book that Mr. Glissan now has before him contains the valuation from 1828 to the present day, inclusive of all the houses?—It does; all the premises that are subject to the lamp and watch-tax in the town of Clonmel.

Mr.
Michael Glissan.

1 May 1837.

Mr.
Patrick J. Keily.

Mr.
Patrick J. Keily.
1 May 1837.

7553. As to that particular house, then, the result is this, that in 1828 it was valued at 12*l.*, and it is valued at this day at 12*l.*?—It still continues valued the same.

1554. *Chairman.*] And always has been the same valuation?—Always.

Mr. Glisson's Examination resumed.

Mr. M. Glisson.

7555. Mr. Serjeant *Bell.*] Now will you attend to this; I find, in the evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins, No. 2868, and the three or four following questions, the witness was asked: "Do you state that Laurence Cashin was registered?—Not in 1832, but since that." "When?—Since 1832 he appears upon the list of registered persons." "You know it only by his appearing upon the list?—That is all." "What do you conceive the value of his house to be?—Seven or eight pounds." Now do you agree with Mr. Joseph Higgins that Laurence Cashin's house would be valued at 7*l.* or 8*l.*?—I do not. I know that from its situation it is impossible to say it could be got for that rent.

7556. And that is a house you find valued in 1828 and at the present day at 12*l.*?—It is.

7557. *Chairman.*] Have you ever been in that house?—I have; my father has premises the very next adjoining.

7558. What sort of a house is it?—A slated house, two stories high.

7559. Any garden ground attached to it?—A small garden.

7560. Do you know the rent of it?—No, I do not know the rent.

7561. Whose property is it?—I do not know exactly; I believe it was the widow Kelly's, who has since left Clonmel; she is living, not dead.

7562. Mr. Serjeant *Bell.*] Now I find this question and answer in the evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins, No. 3063: "In addition to counsel and agents employed, a considerable number of the conservatives attended the registry and assisted?—I do not think they did." Now you attended the registry, as you told us, except for half of the first day; is that true, that a considerable number of conservatives did not attend or assist?—A good many attended, but whether they were conservatives or what they were, I do not know.

7563. Do you not know the fact that a considerable number of conservatives did attend and assist at that registry?—I know a good many Protestants attended, but whether conservatives I cannot say.

7564. But persons in the interest of Mr. Bagwell?—Decidedly.

7565. A considerable number of the persons in the interest of Mr. Bagwell attended at the registry and assisted; is not that so?—Yes, there was a very great excitement at the time of the registry; a good many of what they call liberals on the one side and a good many what they call conservatives on the other side.

7566. Here is another question, No. 3065: "The Quakers were in the conservative interest?—Not in the conservative interest." Do you agree in that statement, that the Quakers were not in the conservative interest?—I do not.

7567. Is it not a fact that the Quakers in Clonmel are notoriously in the conservative interest?—Yes.

7568. Mr. *O'Connell.*] And violently, at least strongly?—Yes, so far as to a man they always go in the corporation interest.

7569. Mr. Serjeant *Bell.*] Now as an instance of the strong interest that the Quakers took in the success of the corporation cause or the conservative cause, do you recollect one very eminent and respectable Quaker there, Mr. David Malcomson, having actually turned off a man from his employ, of the name of Luby, because he voted for Mr. Ronayne?—I know he left his employ immediately after the election.

7570. Voluntarily?—No, I believe not.

7571. Have you any doubt of it?—No, I have not.

7572. That he was turned off?—Luby himself told me he was turned off.

7573. Now in addition to that, did not Luby, after being turned off by David Malcomson for voting for Mr. Ronayne, fail in obtaining employment from any of the Quakers in Clonmel?—He has not been employed by any of them since.

7574. *Chairman.*] I believe Mr. Malcomson is one of the most eminent merchants in Clonmel, is he not?—Indeed he is.

7575. Mr.

7575. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Employs a great many people?—A vast number.

7576. Has he a cotton manufactory?—He has.

7577. How many people does he employ?—I have heard it frequently remarked that he employed from 600 to 700 persons.

7578. Mr. O'Connell.] He has large mills besides, has he not?—He has.

7579. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Not in Clonmel?—No, his cotton factory is down in the county of Waterford.

7580. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] You say the Quakers are all conservatives; of what persuasion are you?—I am a Roman-catholic.

7581. And how are all the Roman-catholics there, generally speaking, as to politics; are they conservatives?—I believe a great number are what are called radicals.

7582. Do you know any of them at all that are called conservatives?—If we were to estimate it by the way they voted, there are some that are conservatives.

7583. How many?—At Mr. Bagwell's last election there were, I should think, nearly 40.

7584. And you consider those 40 conservatives?—I do not know what they are, except as to principles.

7585. Then you do not think it altogether a disgrace to a man being a conservative?—Not knowing what are their principles, I cannot say whether it is or not.

7586. I only wanted your opinion?—I could not form an opinion about it: I was asked the other day, and I said I did not know what was the meaning of conservative or radical.

7587. Do you ever use the word conservative?—Never, except in reply to questions.

7588. Then what did you mean by saying the Quakers were all conservatives?—They are of that party that are called conservatives; I do not know whether they are conservatives or not.

7589. You do not think it disgraceful to a man being a conservative?—Not knowing the meaning of the word, I do not know whether it is or not.

7590. Are you really serious in telling the Committee you do not know what is the meaning of conservative?—I am indeed serious; I do not know; I gave an answer the best I could.

7591. Can you tell me what a radical is?—I say a man who would wish to see cheap governments and abolition of tithes; that if he is a radical, I am a radical.

7592. And a repeal of the Union, I dare say?—No, I would not go so far as that.

7593. Mr. O'Connell.] Why would you not?—Because I do not think it is exactly the time to do justice to Ireland; we expect justice from our sister kingdom, and we would not like to see a division, in case of justice being done to our country.

7594. But if justice were not done by England, you think we ought to get it for ourselves, if we can?—Indeed I am one of those who would look for it, as far as my humble means go.

7595. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] You did not mean to convey any slur, anything disparaging to that body of Quakers, when you said they were conservatives?—Not the least.

7596. Are not the Quakers in Clonmel a very respectable body of people?—Very much so.

7597. Is there any body of the community more obedient to the laws, and more peaceable in their ordinary demeanor, than the Quakers?—I believe they are more obedient to the laws, either by passive resistance or obedience as they call it, than other people generally are.

7598. Are they not ordinarily as industrious a class of the community as any other whatever?—They are.

7599. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Are they fond of paying tithes?—They are compelled to pay them.

7600. Are they fond of it?—I believe not.

7601. Mr. O'Connell.] They do not pay tithes voluntarily?—No.

7602. Mr.

Mr. H. Higgins.

1 May 1837.

7602. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] Yet they are obedient to the laws?—They allow flour or any article they deal in to be taken away and hear no more about it.
7603. Did you ever hear any one of them resist it with a strong hand?—No.
7604. Or disturb the peace?—No.
7605. And do you think they like, in all those districts, to pay tithes?—What their private feelings are I cannot say.
7606. Do you think they are fond of that law?—I think they are not.
7607. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Those 40 Catholics who voted for Mr. Bagwell, did you ever hear they had any other motive for voting except principle?—Indeed I know some of them had; that they got money or patronage.
7608. You heard that?—I did.
7609. Mr. Serjeant *Jackson*.] From whom did you hear it?—From some of those who did vote for Mr. Bagwell.
7610. Those Roman-catholics?—Yes.
7611. They told you themselves?—They did.
7612. Some of the men themselves told you?—Yes.
7613. Did they tell you what they got?—One did.
7614. *Chairman*.] What did he get?—Two guineas.
7615. From whom?—He did not state from whom; he said he got two guineas for his vote.
7616. What was the name of that man?—John Hennessy.
7617. Where does he live?—In Hopkin's-lane.
7618. Did he tell you when he got that bribe?—Long after the election.
7619. What election?—The last contested election.
7620. He did not tell you from whom he got it?—No.
7621. Mr. *Hamilton*.] You have already stated he was one of Mr. Bonayne's voters?—

Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] No, the reverse; is he not the person whom I asked you whether it was not the fact that he had voted in both instances for Mr Bagwell?

Witness.] He is the same person.

7622. He is the person of whom Mr. Higgins said he voted both ways?—Yes.
7623. Mr. Serjeant *Jackson*.] Did you hear that any people got anything for voting the other way?—I believe it was not to be had.
7624. You do not mean to say if they could get it they would not take it?—I do not know.
7625. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] Now in the same evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins, No. 3105, I find these questions and answers: "Do you know Joshua Moore in Johnson-street?—Yes." "Is he not in your list of objections?—No." "Suppose that he is only valued at 6*l.*, what would you say to that?—I think that is part of Everard's concern; I think that is immediately connected with Everard's house; they are very closely connected together." "Now supposing he pays 15*l.* a year rent?—I am certain that Joshua Moore did not rent any place at the time we made the valuation." Now do you know Joshua Moore's house?—I do; my father is landlord of it.
7626. Then do you know Everard's house?—I do; my father is landlord of that also.
7627. Are you quite sure I examined you to this before?—I am quite sure.
7628. Did I ask you the question whether the fact stated by Joseph Higgins is true, namely, that Joshua Moore's is part of Everard's concern?—You did not ask me that question.

7629. You heard me read this evidence of Mr. Higgins; in answer to that question, what would he say if the valuation in the book was only 6*l.*; he answers, "I think that is part of Everard's concern; that is Joshua Moore's; I think that is immediately connected with Everard's house; they are very closely connected together." Now I ask you is that true, namely, that Joshua Moore's is part of Everard's concern?—No, quite distinct entirely; two different sets of premises.

7630. Mr. *Hamilton*.] I think you said your father is proprietor of both?—He is.

7631. They join?—They join; the two houses join.

7632. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] Now does it happen that Joseph Higgins, who took

on himself to state here that Joshua Moore's was part of Everard's concern, actually lives within a few yards of both; is not that the fact?—There is but one house between Joshua Moore's and Mr. Higgins'.

7633. Mr. *Hamilton*.] You have stated, I think, that Joshua Moore got an additional room since 1828?—No; the former tenant did; a man of the name of Delahunt.

7634. Then from whose premises was that room taken?—That room was taken from premises that my father was living in at the time he accommodated his tenants by giving them a room each, for which they paid an additional rent.

7635. Was that room on the side of Joshua Delahunt's premises, next to Everard's or on the other side?—It was immediately over the part he held before.

7636. The learned Member for Clonmel has put it to you, whether it was correct Mr. Higgins stating that that was a part of Everard's concern: refer to the evidence and tell me whether he does not say, "I think it was a part"?—

Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Yes, he does; he says, "I think that is part of Everard's concern. I think that it is immediately connected with Everard's house."

Witness.] They were not connected together for the last 20 years, for I have had knowledge of them for the last 20 years.

7637. Now I go to No. 3129, and I find this question and answer: "Have not they good substantial shops, provision shops and hucksters' shops?—In the first place, the better description of houses do not let cellars underneath; the more respectable persons prefer keeping the cellars for their own houses." Now I wish you to state whether that is the fact or not, that the better description of houses do not let the cellars under their houses?—There are a great number of respectable houses that let their cellars under their shops; a great number.

7638. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Do what are usually called the gentlemen of the town let cellars under their houses?—They generally have not cellars.

7639. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Then the private houses have not cellars?—Not except those where the passage is in the interior of the house.

7640. The private houses have not cellars opening into the street?—No.

7641. Mr. *Hamilton*.] So that, in point of fact, the gentlemen do not let cellars under their houses?—I do not know any instance of it.

7642. And the class of people who do are shopkeepers?—Yes, grocers and so on.

7643. *Chairman*.] Now take Main-street, how many cellars are there under shops?—I dare say there are at least 80 cellars in Main-street let.

7644. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] And Main-street I believe is the principal street in the town?—It is the principal street in the town.

7645. So that there are not less than 80 cellars let in the principal street in the town?—On a rough calculation I think there are 80.

7646. *Chairman*.] There are as many as 80 let?—Eighty let or for the purpose of letting; I do not know whether they are all tenanted or not.

7647. But are in the habit of being let?—Yes.

7648. Where they can get tenants?—Yes.

7649. And how many are there altogether, in round numbers?—I do not think there are more than eight or ten others that have cellars in Main-street and do not let them.

7650. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Do you happen to know what rent Everard pays?—I should think he pays between 11*l.* and 12*l.*, as far as my recollection will serve me.

7651. Your father is the landlord?—He is.

7652. Be so good as attend to this: in the same evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins, who lives but a door off Everard, 3103, I find this question and answer:

"Suppose that, in point of fact, you valued him only at 6*l.*, what would you say to that?—As I did not object to that man in my list, I did not take his house into consideration, but I do think it would not let for 10*l.*" Now do you agree with Mr. Joseph Higgins in that statement?—I do not.

7653. In the same evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins I find this statement:

"2898. Are houses all let at a rack-rent?—Not at a rack rent; what do you mean by a rack rent?"—"A rack rent is the extreme value." You were understood

Mr. N. Glines.

1 May 1837.

stood to say, that it was the practice to let houses at the extreme value?—The practice is to get the full value for the premises, and I would call the rack-rent something beyond that." "Something beyond the full value?—Something beyond the full marketable value." "The practice is to let the houses at their full value, but not beyond the full value?—To let houses at the full value." Now you hear it stated there by Mr. Joseph Higgins, that the practice in Clonmel is to let houses at the full value; now do you agree in that statement?—I do not think that the practice is to let them at the full value; but when they find a good tenant, they will give a preference at a reduction of 1*l.* or 2*l.* or 3*l.*; in small houses, I mean.

7654. So that, in your judgment, the solvency and respectability of the tenant operates as an inducement to the landlord to give him the premises at less than the value?—Decidedly. I know this, that my father might get now 2*l.* or 3*l.* more for each house than each of the tenants pay; but they are solvent tenants, and he does not choose to disturb them, though they are only yearly tenants.

7655. So that in the instance of your father, he makes a sacrifice of 2*l.* or 3*l.* on each house, merely to have solvent and respectable tenants?—Yes, if they pay their rents fairly, and according as they become payable.

7656. *Chairman.*] I suppose your father prefers letting his house to a tenant who will pay him with a great degree of certainty 10*l.* a year, to letting his house to a tenant who, although he pretends to pay 10*l.* a year, might very likely not pay him at all?—I think he would even get from a solvent tenant 2*l.* or 3*l.* a year higher than they are set at present.

7657. Then am I to understand that the custom of your father and the custom of individuals in Clonmel is to underlet their houses?—Under the circumstance of getting a person recommended in the first instance as being a proper person, after he has been some time in the house, they give him the house at a reasonable rent.

7658. What do you call a reasonable rent?—What I call a reasonable rent is a fair rent, not a rack-rent.

7659. What you would call a marketable rent, perhaps?—Yes, an encouraging rent I would call it, for a person to live in the house at all.

7660. That is to say, that it is the custom then not to screw the rent to such an extent as to prevent respectable tenants taking those houses, I suppose; is that what you mean?—When I say that I know very little, I will not say that I know a great deal as to the general custom in Clonmel, except from hearsay; but they are instances of my father that I speak of.

7661. Do you think that is the custom in other places, or do you mean that it is peculiar to Clonmel?—I think there is nothing peculiar in Clonmel that is not usual in other places.

7662. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Now do you remember Jacob Bardin, of Hopkins-lane, claiming to be registered before Mr. Guthrie?—I do.

7663. Now attend to this, 3892 and 3893 in the evidence of Mr. Smith: "Do you know Jacob Bardin, of Hopkins-lane?—Yes." "Can you state the nature of his possession, or occupation of the house?—Yes; he had but one room, with a small something, in the nature of a cupboard, off the stairs; he is a painter and glazier, and it is a most wretched room as can be indeed, that he had at the time of his registering; and he went forward, and he was questioned as to his being a lodger, and he admitted his being a lodger (I was present at this) and paying 10*l.* a week; and he was asked by the presiding harrister, Mr. Guthrie, was it worth 10*l.* a year, or was it of the *bond fide* value of 10*l.* a year; and he said it was to him worth it, and he was registered." Now what I ask you is, whether upon that occasion Jacob Bardin did not state that he claimed to register out of his workshop?—He did.

7664. And did he state anything as to his having the exclusive entry, or right of entry, to that workshop, distinct from the other parts of the house, or as to his having the exclusive possession of the approach to that house?—He did.

7665. You find that is omitted in this answer of Mr. William Smith?—Yes.

7666. And you have no doubt that whatever the fact may have been, Bardin stated to the harrister he had that exclusive approach or entry to his workshop?—He did.

7667. *Mr.*

7667. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know the extent of Bardin's premises; how many rooms he has altogether?—I do not know his premises at all.

7668. Can you state whether he has a room and a workshop separate?—I never was in them.

7669. Then you are not able to state whether the man to whom the learned Member for Clonmel has referred you, has reference to his workshop or to his apartment?—I am not.

7670. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But you are quite sure he stated he claimed to register out of his workshop?—I am.

7671. Mr. Hamilton.] But you are not sure that may not have been the room to which Mr. Smith refers?—I am not.

7672. Do you know the rent he was liable to pay?—No.

7673. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You observe Smith states that Bardin admitted that he paid but 10*d.* a week; now do you remember whether Bardin did not state, in point of fact, that he was a yearly tenant?—I cannot charge my recollection with it.

7674. Do you know the fact yourself, whether he be a yearly tenant or not?—No, I do not.

7675. Now be so good as to attend to these questions and answers in the evidence of Mr. William Smith (3904): "Do you know Thomas Mackie of White's-lane?—I do." "Is he a lodger?—He is a lodger; I was present at his registry." "Do you know what rent he pays?—He stated his rent to be from 10*d.* to 14*d.*; I do not exactly know now the number of pence, but it was such an extraordinary scene almost to see him come forward to register, that it created a sensation in court. He was cross-examined very minutely by Mr. Welch, how it was that it was worth to him 10*l.* after his own admission; he stated it was worth to him by rearing pheasants. He did not give an explanation of this, but it was generally well known that this alluded to his keeping a house of ill fame, and the females he called pheasants, and that by that means it was worth to him 10*l.* a year." Now you know Thomas Mackie?—I do, and have done for many years.

7676-7. You know his house?—I do.

7678. Now, then, I ask you whether there is any truth in that statement, that it was generally well known that he alluded to his keeping a house of ill fame, and the females he called pheasants, and that by that means it was worth to him 10*l.* a year?—Never.

7679. Is there any part of it truth?—No.

7680. Did Mackie ever keep a house of ill fame?—Never. I have been living in Clonmel 25 or 26 years, and I would have heard of it; that is the first I ever heard of it.

7681. Is he a married man?—He is.

7682. Has he a family?—Yes; grown-up daughters.

7683. Do they live with him?—They do.

7684. Then I understand you to say there is not the slightest truth or approach to truth in that statement that Mackie kept a house of ill fame?—Not the slightest. He is a man who is fond of cocks and birds of every description, and goes about fighting mains of cocks, and a bird-fancier in general; and I always understood that between that and his trade he supported himself.

7685. What is his trade?—He is a stone-mason.

7686. Chairman.] Did you ever hear of his rearing a pheasant?—No, I never did.

7687. Did you ever hear that any evidence was given touching that subject before the Election Committee of 1833?—I think he did at the registry mention something about rearing pheasants.

7688. Were you examined before that Election Committee?—I was examined before that Election Committee.

7689. Did you ever hear that evidence was given before that Election Committee to the effect that this man stated that he carried on a trade then in the sale of eggs, rearing pheasants and so forth?—No, I never heard that.

7690. Did you ever hear him state to the registering barrister he reared pheasants?—I think he did; I am almost positive he did.

7691. Do you believe he ever did rear pheasants?—I do not believe he ever did.

Mr. M. Glissan.

1 May 1837.

7692. Mr. *Hamilton*.] But you think he said he did before the registering barrister?—I am quite satisfied he did say something about pheasants.

7693. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Then you cannot give us any information with regard to the cock-fighting?—No.

7694. Or the crossing?—I know there is a description of cocks that they call pheasant-cocks; there are people who are fond of rearing cocks, who generally get what they call a cross breed with pheasants; I have only heard that; I am not a bird-fancier.

7695. But do you conceive he alluded to that instead of alluding to keeping a house of ill fame?—I do not think he alluded at all to keeping a house of ill fame; I rather think he alluded to the breed of cocks; he did perhaps call them pheasants.

7696. Cocks crossed by pheasants?—Yes.

7697. Mr. *Morgan John O'Connell*.] The common name for them is a pheasant cock?—A pheasant cock.

7698. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Now in the same evidence Mr. William Smith, No. 3822, he is asked "Is it your recollection that he expressed his readiness to receive evidence contradicting the oath of the party?—I do not recollect that I stated anything of his readiness." He is then asked, "That he expressed his readiness to receive any evidence that should be produced in contradiction of the claim of the party?—I do not recollect I stated that." "Do you now recollect whether he did or not in your presence?—No, I do not; I do not recollect that he ever did state his readiness to hear evidence if tendered to him." Now, Mr. Glissan, you attended regularly; will you be so good as to say whether you do not recollect him to have stated his readiness to have received evidence in either way to contradict the claim of the party?—I have heard him frequently during that registry express his readiness to hear evidence to the contrary.

7699. To the contrary of what?—Of the value of the premises.

7700. That is contradicting the claim?—Contradicting or impugning the claim.

7701. Now No. 3816 of Mr. William Smith's evidence: "I ask you now, with reference to the evidence you gave before the Election Committee in 1833, what you stated to be Mr. Guthrie's principle of registering at that time?—As far as I can recollect, it was this; that he took the oath of the claimant in preference to any evidence tendered at the period of his registry." You hear that answer; now is it your recollection that Mr. Guthrie took the oath of the claimant in preference to any evidence tendered at the time of his registry; that is to say, that he believed the oath of the claimants in every instance and did not believe in any instance the evidence tendered against the oath of the claimant?—In many instances he took the evidence impugning the registry of the elector in preference to his own. In some cases he took the oath of the party applying in opposition to the verbal statements against it.

7702. What do you mean by verbal statements?—The person's saying it was not worth 10*l.*; he said he was ready to hear evidence on oath, but that he could not take verbal assertions against a man's oath.

7703. By verbal do you mean unsworn?—Yes.

7704. So that in those instances you are now speaking of he believed the oath of the claimant in preference to the unsworn statement of a bystander?—Yes.

7705. *Chairman*.] Give one instance in which a person being a bystander offered to give evidence, and still he refused to take the oath?—Not a bystander; there were persons who seemed anxious about the registry, not merely as bystanders.

7706. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] What do you mean by persons who seemed anxious about the registry?—Persons in Mr. Bagwell's interest, who attended there not merely as bystanders.

7707. *Chairman*.] Will you state the name of any individual who offered to depose to the value of a tenement, but who refused to verify that deposition upon oath, or to be sworn to the truth of that deposition, or of that statement?—To the best of my recollection, a man of the name of Patrick Morrioy *did*.

7708. Well, what did he do?—That in some instances he stated that the premises out of which the claimant sought to be registered were not of the value of 10*l.*

7709. *Did*

7709. Did he offer to give evidence of that?—He did not on oath.

7710. Then that was simply a statement, but not a proffer to give evidence?

—He was asked whether he could swear it, and he declined.

7711. In that case Mr. Guthrie did not attend to him?—He did not.

7712. Do you mean to say there was no instance in which such evidence was given, in which that evidence was not on oath, in which that evidence was not disregarded by Mr. Guthrie?—I believe there were instances.

7713. Did Mr. Guthrie, in his decisions, as far as you apprehended them, consider the value of a 10 *l.* tenement in the same way as those parties that supported Mr. Bagwell's interests considered the value of a 10 *l.* tenement to be?—When there was an oath on each side, first the claimant as to the getting his franchise, and then the oath of a person on the contrary, he called on the claimants to have some other persons to prove the premises were worth 10 *l.*, and when such a person was produced and sworn to knowing the value from his knowledge of the premises, he generally admitted them in opposition to the evidence given to him by a single person who sought that the man should not get his franchise.

7714. But what I want to know from you is, whether or no the parties objecting on the part of Mr. Bagwell agreed with Mr. Guthrie as to what should be deemed the clear value of a 10 *l.* tenement?—I am almost satisfied that what he said was, that it should be a payment of 10 *l.* rent.

7715. That is what you understood Mr. Guthrie to say?—What I understood their objection was, that he ought not to register any one who paid a less rent than 10 *l.*

7716. And what did Mr. Guthrie say was sufficient to satisfy the Act of Parliament?—I think Mr. Guthrie's replies in general were, he did not inquire what rent they paid for the house, if it was shown to him it was of the value of 10 *l.*

7717. What did Mr. Guthrie, to your understanding, deem to be the standard value of a 10 *l.* tenement?—I think he took the matter of dealing a good deal into his consideration; the situation the person was in, and the business he carried on.

7718. Then, in fact, to what was the rent he added what the parties might obtain by their trade in the house; is that what you mean?—I think he took, in some measure, into consideration the situation.

7719. Well, did the parties opposing those claims admit that mode of interpreting the Act of Parliament?—They did not.

7720. Then there was that difference between them?—There was.

7721. Mr. *Hawilton*.] Were you present when the case of Patrick Burke, of No. 2, Dispensary-street, was adjudicated upon?—I rather think not; that was on the first day's examination, when I was not there; they were called alphabetically, and I think they had gone through the letter B, or nearly so, before I attended.

7722. Can you state to the Committee any instance in which evidence had been tendered by the claimant on behalf of his franchise and evidence had been given against it, and the barrister called a third person as a witness?—There were such instances; but I could not take on myself to say what were the particular instances now, from the lapse of time.

7723. Can you state how many witnesses were, in point of fact, examined during the whole registration, against the franchise?—Examined against the registry?

7724. Against the claimant?—I know there were a good many; but to say the particular number of persons, or particular cases that were objected to and the proof given, I could not charge my memory with it.

7725. Are you not aware that, after a few cases had been gone into by the barrister, persons declined giving evidence?—I know that in some cases they did.

7726. Do you know on what grounds they declined?—I think it was principally when Mr. Guthrie decided; his view was that the Act did not require payment of 10 *l.* rent.

7727. Then it is your opinion that those were the grounds upon which individuals declined coming forward to give evidence?—To the best of my recollection, they were.

7728. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Now, with reference to the question just put to you,

Mr. M. Gillson.
1 May 1837.

you, I find in the evidence of Mr. William Smith, commencing 3852, he was asked, "You say there were from 60 to 80 whose premises, in your judgment, were under the marketable value of 10 l.; now, how many of those are now on the register, as well as you can calculate?—I think there are very near 60." "Then there is near the minimum number registered, according to your judgment?—Yes, under value." "Have there not been deaths since, or removals?—There have." "Then, of course, if there have been deaths and removals, there are not 60?—But there are others since, which I consider under value also; but how can the present barristers, or any barrister, ascertain the value of them, when they go forward and swear it." "Then, in your judgment, some of them have been registered both by Mr. Hobson and Mr. Howley?—Very few indeed." "Were they opposed?—So far as cross-examination went, but no witnesses tendered." Now, you hear it stated there, by Mr. William Smith, that cross-examination was only resorted to in the case of Mr. Hobson and Mr. Howley, and that no witnesses were tendered to oppose the franchise; is it your recollection that that is true?—There were some instances where witnesses did attend, for the purpose of tendering their cross-examination as to the value.

7729. And were they examined?—They were.

7730. Before Mr. Hobson and Mr. Howley?—Yes.

7731. Then it is not the fact that no witnesses were tendered for examination, to oppose the franchise?—It is not.

7732. *Chairman.*] Upon what points were these contrary witnesses examined before Mr. Hobson and Mr. Howley?—As to possession; as to persons having been six months in possession, and as to the value of the premises.

7733. When were those witnesses tendered as to the value of the premises?—At the time of the registry, at the quarter sessions.

7734. But last October, January, or when?—I think there is scarcely a session that parties are not opposed to each other on the registry.

7735. But what I want to know is, is it evidence as to value or non-value of the premises?—That generally occurs at the sessions at Clonmel; there are sessions held in other towns for the borough of Clonmel; there were until now.

7736. But when was the last case, to your recollection, in which witnesses were called to oppose the admission of any parties on the ground of holding a tenement of the value of 10 l.?—I do not think there have been any for the last two quarter sessions.

7737. Do you think there was in the quarter sessions before that?—They were so strictly examined, I should take it, by Mr. Howley himself, that the parties considered that he would, from his line of cross-examination, sift the question before he admitted any person to his franchise.

7738. Mr. Howley inflicts a very severe cross-examination on the applicant, does he?—He examines them as to the value of their possessions.

7739. He cross-examines them very severely, is that it; very strictly?—I would call it strictly, not severely.

7740. Not improperly, but strictly?—No, not improperly, but strictly.

7741. And therefore, since he has been in the habit of so cross-examining them, there have been no witnesses tendered against them, is that so?—No, the electors on both sides feel a confidence in his line of cross-examination.

7742. Mr. Serjeant *Bell.*] In the evidence of Mr. Richard Legge, No. 4329 the following question and answer occur: "Do you know the house of Joshua Moore, in Johnson-street?—Yes, I know the house; that is, I cannot say I was in it and through it, but I know Joshua Moore is a householder, and lives in a certain street." "Do you happen to know the valuation of that house; what sum that was valued at?—No, I could not tell without reference to the book." "What do you take to be the value of that house at present?—Indeed I should think any house in that line of street could not be worth more than 10 l." "Would you be surprised to hear he actually pays 15 l. a year rent?—I would not." "And that being the case, would you be surprised to hear that the valuation of that house is only 6 l.?—Yes, that would surprise me; it is a thing I would not be prepared to expect." Now, I believe I asked you, when you were examined the last day, as to the value of the house of Joshua Moore, did I not?—You did.

7743. Now you observe, he says, "I should think any house in that line of street

street could not be worth more than 10 l.;" now you know that line of street ? I do.

7744. Johnson-street ?—It is immediately opposite my house.

7745. Is your house in Johnson-street ?—Yes, it is just immediately opposite my house.

7746. Now do you agree in that statement of Mr. Richard Legge, that no houses in that line of street could be worth more than 10 l. ?—There is not any house I should think, within half-a-dozen houses on either side, set at 10 l. or so low.

7747. Do I understand you to mean, that with the exception of about half-a-dozen houses, every house in the street is set above 10 l. ?—Yes, about that immediate part of the street.

7748. About that immediate part ?—Yes.

7749. Now do you know that some houses in that line of street are paying as much as 50 l. and 60 l. a year ?—They are.

7750. Then it is not true that no house in that line of street can be worth more than 10 l. ?—Mr. Higgins, who lives next door but one, pays 50 l. or 60 l. a year rent, I believe, himself.

7751. Then the statement of Mr. Richard Legge, that no house in that line of street can be worth more than 10 l. a year, is untrue ?—It is.

7752. Mr. Hamilton.] Mr. Higgins, you state, occupies a very valuable house ?—He does; I believe his rent is 50 l. a year, and I believe he gave 200 l. or 300 l. on getting into possession.

7753. He has a good deal of property in Clonmel ?—Yes.

7754. An extensive establishment there ?—He has an extensive nursery, not immediately in the town, but convenient to the town; he is very respectably in trade.

7755. Mr. Serjeant Bell.] Now, in the evidence of George Graham, No. 4921, I find this: "Can you state the circumstances of Walter and William Keating in respect of their holding ?—Yes, they are ironmongers; both their names appeared on the registry, and both of them voted; the father was living at the time, and, I believe, was the sole owner of the concern; the accounts and all was done in the father's name exclusively." "Can you state whether or not he had let the premises, or any part of them, to his sons ?—I should think not." "Do you know ?"—I do not of myself know, but I rather think not; I know that in purchasing anything, the accounts were made out exclusively in the father's name." "Can you state how they occupied this house ?—Not from my own personal knowledge, but I believe in common; I know some five or six years since they did; since that I am not acquainted with it." "Can you state when they were registered ?—They were registered the first registry under the Reform Act." "That was in 1832 ?—I think so." "You cannot state how they occupied at that time ?—It is at that time I am speaking of." "Then do you know they occupied the house in common at that time ?—I rather think they did; I know a short time before that registry they did." You have heard that statement; now I wish to know in what way these two Keatings, William and Walter, registered; do you happen to know that one of them registered out of a store, and the other out of a house ?—I do.

7756. You recollect that perfectly ?—I do; the father's name is Walter, and the way the bills went up to his death was, "Bought of Walter Keating."

7757. Is not there a William ?—There is a William, who registered out of a store distinct from the house entirely.

7758. So that there was but one registry, and that by the son, and that was out of a house; and there was another registry by William, the brother of Walter, jun., and that was out of a store ?—Yes.

7759. You have no doubt of that ?—Not the least.

7760. Chairman.] Where is that store situated ?—It is in a lane at the back; at least there is a passage from a door or two of the house that Walter registered out of to this lane, and the other is an iron store. They are people in extensive trade, and this Walter Keating registered out of a store apart from the house entirely.

7761. Were they partners ?—That I do not know; I do not know their domestic concerns.

7762. Mr. Hamilton.] Are you speaking of William, or Walter, having registered out of the store ?—William.

Mr. M. Glinan

1 May 1837.

7763. How was that store occupied?—They keep pitch, tar, shovels, and those things fit for country ironmongers.

7764. You say they keep?—I could not say whose property it is; I had occasion to go there for some goods myself, and it was William Keating who uniformly went with me to show me the goods.

7765. The goods belonging to the firm are kept there?—I do not know who the goods belong to.

7766. *Chairman.*] You do not know whether William was the master of the store or not?—I do not.

7767. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] All you know is, that he registered out of the store?—Yes.

7768. And you have seen him there doing business?—Yes, and have done business with him.

7769. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Have you seen Walter there doing business at any time?—No, it was only upon two or three occasions that I went there, and it was William who attended me then.

7770. Is there any advertisement over the store, stating the names of the parties who sell goods there?—To the best of my knowledge there is not any name over the store.

7771. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] In the same evidence of George Graham, No. 4930, he is asked, "Can you state how the Rev. Sackville Burke and James Burke occupy the premises which they hold?"—Yes, James Burke is a respectable woollen-draper; the Rev. Sackville Burke lodged with him, but occupied a suite of apartments of his own; two or three rooms." "Had he a separate entrance?—No, the entrance was in common; but, as well as my recollection hears me out, he registered out of a stable at the rear of Burke's house; not out of his lodging, but out of a stable." "Are the premises valuable?—Burke's dwelling-house is valuable, but I do not think the stable is." "What do you conceive to be the value of the stable?—I really should not think it worth more than 8 l. or 9 l." "Have you seen their names on the registry?—I did. One of them voted, and the other did not." You hear that statement?—Yes.

7772. Now I wish to know, in point of fact, did not both the Messrs. Burke vote at the last election?—I cannot take it on myself to state at the last, but I can at the first; I was in a different department altogether at the last election. I was qualifying the Roman-catholics in a different place as to an oath they were to take, in a different part of the court to where they registered.

7773. You can state positively at the first election both those gentlemen voted?—Yes.

7774. And voted, I believe, for Mr. Bagwell?—They did.

7775. But you cannot, from the circumstance you have just stated, your being absent in another place, you cannot say whether they both voted at the last election or not?—I cannot state positively; if I were to give an opinion about it, I should say they did; but I would not wish to hazard an opinion when I am not certain of it.

7776. But you are quite certain they both voted at the first election for Mr. Bagwell?—Yes.

7777. With respect to what I examined you about before this registry of Joseph Burke out of that part of the premises he held belonging to Prendergast; you recollect I examined you as to that?—Yes.

7778. And the statement on the occasion of his registry; Burke stated he had the exclusive use of the passage to that part of the house he occupied; he swore it; now I wish to know whether, in point of fact, it is not a very usual thing for the owner of a house in Clonmel who lets lodgings, when he retains the shop to himself, to use the shop door as a hall door; to keep the key of the shop door, and to get in through the shop either at night or on a Sunday when the shop is shut up, for his own portion of the premises; is not that a very usual thing?—It is usual.

7779. So as to leave the hall door to his lodgers?—It is usual.

7780. *Chairman.*] Is that usually the bargain between the lodger and the landlord, or the occupier of the house?—As to what the bargain was, that I do not know.

7781. Is it usually the bargain; you say this is the usual practice; I want to know is it usually the practice?—I do not know anything about the bargains except in this particular case. I am aware of the bargain, for I filled
his

his notice, and I said "Unless you have the exclusive right to the hall door, you have no right to be registered;" and he said "I have, for that is my agreement with Prendergast; I have the exclusive right of the hall door."

7782. Prendergast was the landlord?—Yes.

7783. And he kept the shop?—Yes.

7784. And this transaction occurred between you and Burke?—Yes, I was acquainted with Burke; he came to me to fill his notice; he was employed by two gentlemen in the town who had the contract for the forge in the barracks.

7785. What trade was Burke?—He was employed by two gentlemen who had the contract for the barracks in Clonmel, for supplying forge for the artillery; he was their acting agent there; Mr. Joyce and somebody else were the firm.

7786. The contractors, I suppose?—Yes, the forge contractors.

7787. Do you know Richard Moore, son of Richard Moore, late of Clonmel?—Yes.

7788. Who is described in the registry, I think, as having registered as a freeman?—I do; he is my father's landlord; he lives at Summerhill; I think it is Summerhill.

7789. He is registered as a freeman?—He is.

7790. He was registered the 8th April 1833; now, do you know his residence is at Summerhill?—I do; it was when I was leaving home.

7791. And it was on the 8th April 1833?—No, I do not think it was.

7792. Where did he reside then?—I believe he lived somewhere down the North of Ireland at that time.

7793. Well, where does he reside at present?—He resides at Summerhill, or Summerville, within about three miles of Clonmel.

7794. Is it within the limits of the borough?—No.

7795. It is without the limits of the borough?—It is without.

7796. So that at the time of his registry, on the 8th of April 1833, according to your evidence, he was not resident within the borough; is not that so?—He was not.

7797. And he is not so now?—No; the house that his father lived in, in his time, my father now lives in, and has done for some years.

7798. Then you know well that that house is not within the limits of the borough?—The house that his father lived in is within the limits of the borough, but he has ceased to live in it for many years.

7799. But I am speaking of Summerhill, that is not within the limits of the borough?—No, it is not.

7800. Now, do you know Portlaw, the residence of Joseph Malcomson, son of David Malcomson?—I do.

7801. Is that within the limits of the borough?—No, I dare say it is 15 or 16 miles distant from it.

7802. Of course, then, that is not within the limits of the borough?—No.

7803. Do you know he resided there in December 1833; Joseph Malcomson; I find he registered as a householder, but did he not register as a freeman also?—I do not think he did.

7804. Joshua?—Joshua is registered as a freeman.

7805. And John?—And John; and David, I believe.

7806. And Robert?—And Robert.

7807. Now, do they all live at Portlaw, the same place?—They do not.

7808. Well, where do they live?—They live with Mr. Malcomson, senior.

7809. Is that within the limits of the borough?—No.

7810. *Chorwas.*] Is it within seven miles of the borough?—

7811. Mr. Serjeant *Ball.*] Do you happen to know whether their residence is within or without the limits of the borough; the persons whose names I mentioned, Joshua, John, Robert and David Malcomson, junior?—It is within the limits, as laid down by the persons appointed commissioners.

7812. Is it without the old limits of the borough before the commissioners were thought of; did you know the limits of the borough of Clonmel before the Reform Bill was thought of?—I did.

7813. I wish to know whether these gentlemen, whom I have named, resided within or without those limits?—Within, I think.

7814. Did they reside within the limits of the borough when they were admitted freemen; do you know when they were admitted freemen; in 1832?—I think they resided within the old limits of the corporation previous to the passing of the Reform Bill.

Mr. M. Glavin.
1 May 1837.

7815. And they resided there at the time when they were admitted freemen?—I think they did; I am almost sure they did.
7816. Resided within the town?—Yes, within the boundary of the old corporation.
7817. But you state, that although you consider they lived within the boundaries of the town, as those boundaries stood before the Reform Bill, that they did not reside within the boundaries of the town as settled by the commissioners?—Just so, that they do not reside within that new boundary.
7818. Chairman.] You were never employed as a valuator under the commissioners, were you?—Never.
7819. Nor in any other way as a valuator of houses in the town of Clonmel?—Never.

Mr. Dennis Walsh, called in; and Examined.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

7820. Chairman.] WHAT are you?—A grocer and spirit-merchant.
7820*. Where?—In Clonmel.
7821. What part of Clonmel?—The Main street.
7822. How long have you been in that situation?—Near 12 months, living in the Main street; I was in another part of the town before.
7823. What part of the town did you live in before that?—In a place called Morten-street.
7824. How long have you been in business as a grocer and spirit-merchant?—Near 12 months.
7825. What were you before that?—I was living as a clerk.
7826. To whom?—To Mr. Butler.
7827. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Have you taken any pains to ascertain the value of the premises in Clonmel, out of which persons had registered since the Reform Bill?—I have.
7828. You yourself are a registered voter?—I am.
7829. As a householder?—Yes.
7830. You voted for Mr. Ronayne, the popular candidate?—I did not vote; I was not a voter at the time.
7831. Chairman.] Had you a right to vote at that time?—No, I had not.
7832. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You mean to say you had not been six months registered?—I had not.
7833. But you are in the interest of the popular party?—I am.
7834. And your wish is to sustain the popular interest in Clonmel?—Yes.
7835. You are aware that the votes of certain persons who have been registered, were sought to be impugned?—I am.
7836. For under value and otherwise?—I am.
7837. Now you stated that you took pains to ascertain the value of certain premises?—I did.
7838. Did you go to the premises and examine them?—I did.
7839. I am speaking now of your general practice; did you ask questions of the owner or occupiers as to the value or as to the rent they paid?—I did.
7840. Did you do this in several instances?—I did.
7841. Did you ask questions of third persons as well as the owners and occupiers?—I did.
7842. And did you, in a word, exert yourself as much as you could to ascertain the true value of the premises which you supposed would be called in question upon this inquiry?—I did.
7843. Did you take memorandums of the result of your inquiries?—I did.
7844. Now did you go alone, or were you accompanied by any other person?—I was accompanied by other persons.
7845. Who were they?—Mr. Lonergan.
7846. What is his christiann name?—Stephen.
7847. Any one else?—Mr. Butler.
7848. What is his christiann name?—John Butler.
7849. Are they both here in London?—They are.
7850. Do you happen to know whether they, or either of them, also took memorandums of the result of your inquiries?—They did.
7851. Both?—Both.

7852. When

7852. When was it that you were employed in going through this course of inquiry?—I suppose about a fortnight or three weeks before I was summoned.
7853. *Chairman.*] To attend this Committee?—Yes.
7854. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] And you did this for the purpose of enabling yourself to give evidence as to the value of these premises?—I did.
7855. And as to all other particulars with respect to which you might be examined with regard to them; was that so?—Yes.
7856. Do you know the premises of Timothy Dooley, of Dispensary-street?—I do.
7857. Will you describe those premises?—It is a good sized house.
7858. Is there any garden annexed to it?—No, not to Timothy Dooley's there is not.
7859. Is there a yard?—There is a yard and two back houses built on it; three rooms up stairs, and a kitchen and two rooms down stairs.
7860. Do you happen to know whether he lets lodgings?—He does.
7861. Do you know what rent he pays?—£. 8. 10 s. he told me.
7862. Now do you know what he gets for his lodgings?—I do.
7863. How much?—He sets the upper rooms, which he gets 1 s. 6 d. a week for, and there are two of a small description that he gets 1 s. a week for.
7864. That makes 3 s. 6 d. a week?—Yes.
7865. And he has the lower part, the yard and the two back houses, for his own use?—Yes.
7866. Now considering that he pays 8 l. 10 s. a year rent, and that the premises are in other respects what you have described, do you consider them worth 10 l. a year?—I do.
7867. And you deliberately state that as the value of the concern?—I do.
7868. Have you any doubt about it?—I have not.
7869. *Mr. Henslow.*] Now who does that belong to?—Mr. Grubb or Miss Grubb, I do not know which.
7870. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Now, Sir, attend to this; in the evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins, No. 2835, I find these questions and answers, "Do you know Timothy Dooley? I do not know the man; I know his house in Dispensary-street.—Was he registered by Mr. Guffaric? I believe so.—Do you know the value of his house? £. 7 or 8 l. is the value of his house; he pays about 7 l.—What was the value of it at the time of the registration? The same."—Now I ask you whether you knew this house at the time of the registration of Timothy Dooley?—I did.
7871. Do you consider it is the same value now as it was then?—It is.
7872. Now you have stated to me that you consider it as well worth 10 l., and that you know that the tenant pays 8 l. 10 s. rent; is it true, as stated by Mr. Joseph Higgins, that 7 l. or 8 l. is the value, and that he pays about 7 l.?—No; I should say the house is worth 10 l.
7873. And he pays 8 l. 10 s. per year rent?—Yes, he told me so in the year 1833, when I was summoned over here before.
7874. Were you examined?—No, I was not.
7875. Then you made inquiries also in 1833?—I did, on the occasion of the petition against the return of Mr. Ronayne.
7876. And the inquiries you made then, as far as you recollect, correspond; or rather, was the information you obtained then, as far as you can now recollect, the same as you afterwards obtained the other day?—Yes.
7877. *Mr. Henslow.*] You came over at that time with the view, I believe, to sustain objections made by Mr. Ronayne?—I did.
7878. To prove under value in cases of voters of Mr. Bagwell?—Yes, some.
7879. Can you state the names of any of those with regard to whom you were prepared to give evidence of under value?—A man of the name of Robert Norris.
7880. Any other?—John Coghlan.
7881. Any other?—John Bagge.
7882. Any other?—Martin Callaghan.
7883. Any other?—There may be others, but I do not just now recollect them.
7884. Were you prepared to prove that those persons were registered out of premises not worth 10 l.?—I was.
7885. Can you state whether William Burke of Ducket-street was one of those

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

1 May 1837.

those with regard to whom you were prepared to give that evidence?—I was not to give evidence against that man.

7886. James Fitzgerald of Gravel-walk?—Yes, that was another person.

7887. Thomas Kelly of Gravel-walk?—He was summoned here as a witness.

7888. Had you prepared yourself to give evidence with regard to him?—No, I had not.

7889. William Davis of New-street?—No, I do not recollect him.

7890. James Gleeson of Cashel-road?—No.

7891. John Hennessy of Hopkins-lane?—Yes, I was.

7892. Andrew Armstrong of Irish-town?—Yes, I was.

7893. Then it was your opinion, and you were prepared to state it before the Committee, that the premises out of which those men had registered were not worth 10*l*.?—In my opinion they were not.

7894. Now, can you state whether any of those men have been registered since?—No, I do not think they have; I do not recollect just now.

7895. Refer to 16 and tell me if that is the James Fitzgerald of Gravel-walk to whom you alluded?—Yes.

7896. When was he registered?—Under Mr. Guthrie's registry.

7897. You will see the date of the registry there?—Yes, it was in October 1832.

7898. So that in your opinion, at all events, those individuals had been registered out of premises not worth 10*l*.?—That is my opinion.

7899. What is your opinion with regard to the principle of the Reform Act with respect to value; what do you consider to be the meaning of 10*l* value?—For any concern that will be worth 10*l*. they are entitled to register, no matter what rent they pay.

7900. Should you say it was necessary that the value should be a marketable value of 10*l*.?—I think it is necessary that the value should be 10*l*. before they are entitled to register.

7901. Do you conceive that that value should be to the individual himself, or what the premises would bring in the market?—I think it should be worth to any person 10*l*.

7902. You have stated that you have been in the interest of the popular party?—Yes.

7903. I presume you are, like Mr. Glissan, a radical?—There are so many definitions of the word 'radical,' that I really do not know.

7904. I will not trouble you for the definitions; are you a member of the General Association?—I am.

7905. You have been concerned, I believe, in filling up notices for registries on several occasions?—No, I never filled up notices.

7906. Have you caused any notices to be served?—I have.

7907. Have you had much conversation with the persons whose notices you have so caused to be served?—Yes, I have.

7908. Did you expound to them your opinion with regard to value, as you have done now?—No, I do not know that I did; I do not recollect it, if I did.

7909. Did you find them anxious to come forward and register, or the contrary?—Indeed, some were anxious and others were not, according as it happened.

7910. Now, with regard to any of those who were not anxious, did you use any arguments to induce them to go forward?—No.

7911. *Chairman.*] Of those parties that you were about to object to before that Committee, on account of not sufficient value, what were their rents?—Some from 3*l*. to 6*l*. and 7*l*.

7912. Now, who paid 7*l*. rent?—I think Fitzgerald paid 7*l*.; I understood so.

7913. Then, what description of house is Fitzgerald's?—It is a slate house; a small slate house.

7914. What was the occupation of Fitzgerald?—A carpenter.

7915. Was that house of any more value for being a carpenter's?—No, I do not think it was.

7916. What was it rated at by the commissioners?—I do not know.

7917. Why did you suppose it not to be worth 10*l*.?—Because it was a very small house.

7918. That

7918. That was your only reason?—That was my only reason.
7919. But you conceive that no house of that sort is worth 10*l.* a year in Clonmel?—No, I do not think any house in Clonmel of that description is worth 10*l.*
7920. Are there many houses of that description, on account of which persons are registered in Clonmel?—There are some.
7921. Belonging to both parties, I suppose; both political parties in the town?—Yes.
7922. But you were only to speak with regard to those five or six that you mentioned?—Yes, I have stated more than that; I should suppose over a dozen.
7923. Were you to depose before the Committee, in 1833, to the under value of a dozen houses in the town of Clonmel?—I was.
7924. Were you to speak to the under value of all those houses that were of under value in the town of Clonmel?—I was to speak to the under value of those that I valued myself, or the persons with me.
7925. So that there would be more of under value in Clonmel than a dozen?—There were.
7926. Do you mean to say that there was no house, the inhabitant of which was likely to be or was in favour of your political party in Clonmel, that was not under value?—My opinion is, there were houses belonging to both parties.
7927. How many do you think there were belonging to your own party?—I do not exactly know.
7928. Were there five or ten?—I think there were; in my opinion there were.
7929. Which, five or ten?—Ten, and more than ten.
7930. How many do you really think, then, for both parties, without reference to whether there were more on one side or the other, were put on the register, under the value of 10*l.*, in Clonmel?—I do not exactly know.
7931. Were there 20?—I should suppose there were.
7932. Were there 30?—I do not say that.
7933. Would you say there were not?—I would not say there were not; I myself would not say that; I would prove that there were.
7934. But you do not happen to know the value of all the houses in Clonmel, do you?—No, I do not know the value of all the houses.
7935. You have made yourself master of the value of a certain number, but you have not made yourself master of the value of all?—I know very well how these houses are generally situated in Clonmel.
7936. But can you state to the Committee you are aware of the value of all the houses in Clonmel?—I am not aware of the value of all the houses; if I were to take time to go about, I would; I only went to the houses that we understood would be impugned before this Committee.
7937. How came you to understand they would be impugned?—Because the other gentlemen who were examined before us were at the houses, and we understood the houses that they would value.
7938. So that whenever you understood an examination had been made on the one hand, you went and examined them on the other?—We did, of course.
7939. That was what you did?—Yes.
7940. Then I am to understand you have made out a list of 12 houses that are of under value, is that it?—I do not recollect stating that.
7941. You have not made that out?—No; I was asked before how many I had valued, and I said there were about a dozen that I was to give evidence upon here before the Committee.
7942. Then at this moment you cannot state how many there are of under value in Clonmel?—No, I cannot.
7943. Latterly your object has been rather to see that the value was equal to the registry than under the value, was it not?—There are some houses in Clonmel, at least some persons registered, whose houses I would not say were worth 10*l.*
7944. That is your present opinion?—Yes.
7945. Has the value of houses in Clonmel altered much?—I think house-rent has been pretty stationary since the year 1829; it had been getting up from 1829 up to 1831 or 1832, but I think now for the last three or four years it has been stationary.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

1 May 1837.

7946. Therefore, generally speaking, if houses were under value in the year 1838, they are under value now; is that it?—I think they are.

7947. Unless some alteration has been made?—I think house-rent has been pretty much the same in Clonsilla for the last four or five years.

7948. Then your idea with regard to value is what parties can make of their houses by subletting and so forth?—So my idea is with regard to what rent would be had for them if they left the houses, the persons that are in them.

7949. Now supposing Timothy Dooley was to leave his house, what would the owner get for that?—I think he would get 10 l. for it; I am sure he would get 10 l. for it.

7950. From a respectable tenant?—A respectable person.

7951. A responsible tenant?—Such a description of man as himself, a tradesman. There are some houses in the neighbourhood set for 10 l. and 11 l. built lately.

7952. But am I to understand that you are to take as the value of the house what the man gives, what would be the price in the market, or what the man might get by letting lodgings?—No, I think what the price in the market would be.

7953. That is your view between man and man, what can be got and what would be given is the real value of the house?—Yes.

7954. That is your view?—Yes.

7955. And it is on that principle that you valued all these houses, is it?—Yes.

7956. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Of these persons whom you have named, or rather whose premises you were to have impugned, I believe the following are either dead or removed, John Coghlan?—He is dead.

7957. Martin Callaghan and James Fitzgerald, are they dead?—Yes.

7958. Have you any doubt that several of the others whose premises you were to have shown were not of full value, have also either died or removed?—I think the greater part of them are either dead or removed.

7959. Those were persons who voted for Mr. Bagwell?—Yes.

7960. Well now, of the persons who voted for Mr. Ronayne, and whose premises you stated you did not consider of the value of 10 l., are not the greater part of them either dead or removed?—The greater part are either dead or removed.

7961. Then when you stated that there were perhaps 20 at least, and there might have been more, admitted to the registry, whose premises you considered were not of the full value of 10 l. a year, is it your evidence that the greater portion of them are not now on the registry, that is to say, that they are either dead or removed?—The greater part are either dead or removed; there are very few of them on now.

7962. Then is it your impression that at present, of the persons who actually appear competent to vote on the registry, that is to say, who are not dead or removed, is it your impression that there are very few whose premises are not of the full yearly value of 10 l.?—There are very few indeed.

7963. You cannot undertake to say how many?—I cannot.

7964. Do you know the house of Michael Russell of Dispensary-street?—I do.

7965. In the evidence of Mr. William Smith these questions and answers occur: "Do you know the house occupied by William Russell, weaver, Dispensary-street? I do."—That ought to be Michael.

7966. "Describe that house? It consists of a kitchen and two small rooms on the same floor with the kitchen, and two rooms up stairs; there is a small yard, and a very small garden, of equal breadth with the house, about 30 feet long; a very small garden attached to the house.—The house, which is in front, being 30 feet? No, the garden; the house is not quite the breadth of the garden; 30 feet long the garden is.—What extent do you suppose the front of the house to be? I should think about 16 feet.—Is it thatched, or slated? It is slated.—Two stories or one? There are two rooms over the kitchen, and two small bed-rooms on the same floor as the kitchen.—What do you conceive to be the value of that house? £.7 a year I reckon the value of it.—Was it included in the valuation of 1828? It was.—At what rate? I do not know; I have not seen the valuation book since I valued the town." Now, do you know that house and premises well?—I do.

7967. Russell

7967. Russell is described here as a weaver; is he a weaver?—He is not
 a weaver. *Mr. Dennis Walsh.*
7968. What is he, in point of fact?—An upholsterer.
7969. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Was he so at the time of his registry; was he an upholsterer in 1828?—He was.
7970. Is there nobody else of that name a weaver?—No.
7971. *Chairman.*] Is he entered on the registry as a weaver?—I do not know, but I know he has been an upholsterer for the last 15 years.
7972. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Now, that is the evidence of Mr. William Smith with respect to this house; now I call your attention to the description of this house of Michael Russell's, as given by Mr. William Smith. He says, "It consists of a kitchen, and two small rooms on the same floor with the kitchen, and two rooms up stairs." Now, you know those premises?—I do.
7973. Now, is that a true description of the premises?—It is not.
7974. In what respect does it depart from the fact, according to your recollection?—There are three rooms up stairs.
7975. Now it appears, though I cannot give the number of the question, at least it is so, that Mr. Higgins states the value to be 8 l.; Mr. Higgins, in his examination, and Mr. Smith, state that there were but two rooms up stairs; now, assuming the value to be but 8 l., if there were two rooms only, would you consider the circumstance of there being a third room as adding to the value; I presume there is no doubt of that?—I think the value ought to be more than 8 l.
7976. Why, then, if Smith, stating there to be but two rooms, would admit the value to be 8 l., or Higgins stating the value to be 8 l., and you know the fact to be that it has three rooms, would you not consider it was worth more than 8 l.?—I would.
7977. Now, in other respects, will you describe that; has it a garden?—It has.
7978. A yard?—Yes.
7979. A pig-sty?—Yes.
7980. Do you consider the rooms what are called good rooms for such a place?—They are indeed.
7981. Now is it let to lodgers?—Yes, it is.
7982. Is it near Dooley's?—It is.
7983. Now is it much the same kind of house as Dooley's?—The very same, only that there are two small houses built on Dooley's; back houses.
7984. And there are no two small houses built on the other?—There is one on the other.
7985. Now do you know the house of Roach and Toole?—I do.
7986. Is that house near Russell's?—It is in the same row.
7987. Do you consider that house of Roach and Toole's to be more or less valuable than Russell's?—I think they are the same.
7988. Do you recollect whether, in point of fact, the garden annexed to Roach and Toole's house is not smaller than the garden annexed to Russell's?—It is something smaller; not to say a great deal; not much.
7989. Why then if Roach and Toole's house be worth 10 l., have you any doubt that Russell's is worth as much?—I think Roach and Toole's is as good as Russell's; and I think Russell's is as good as Roach and Toole's.
7990. Now be so good as to attend to this evidence of Mr. William Smith's, 3422. "Do you know the house of Patrick Roach and Patrick Toole? I do.—Do they occupy the same house? The same house; both registered out of the same house.—Describe the house? It consists of two rooms and a kitchen on the ground floor, two rooms up stairs; there is a good sized yard, a garden and two back houses built on the yard.—Are they offices? They are; such as turf-houses or potato-houses; I consider that the full value is 10 l." You hear that evidence?—I do.
7991. Mr. Wm. Smith considered the full value of Roach and Toole's house to be 10 l.; do I understand you to say that Michael Russell's house, in the same row, is just as good a house as Roach and Toole's?—It is every bit.
7992. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Is it valued at the same rate on the commission?—I do not know.
7993. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Now in addition to that, Mr. William Smith was asked this question: "What is the size of the garden?—It is about 20 feet by

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

1 May 1837.

14, as near as I can say; I cannot speak positively to it, but I consider the premises worth 10*l.*" Now in answer to the questions put to him as to Michael Russell's premises, he says, in answer to the question, "The house which is in front being 30 feet?—No, the garden; the house is not quite the breadth of the garden; 30 feet long the garden is."—Now, do you observe there, then, that he says the garden annexed to Michael Russell's house is 30 feet long, and the garden annexed to Roach's house is only 20 feet; he admits that Roach's house is well worth 10*l.*, and can you have any doubt, upon the evidence of Mr. William Smith, that Michael Russell's house is at least worth 10*l.*?—It is the same, only Roach's and Toole's garden is some few feet short of Russell's.

7994. Ten, it seems?—It is not 10 difference.

7995. Did you step it?—I did.

7996. And your impression is that it is not so much?—It is not so much.

7997. *Chairman.*] Not so much difference?—

7998. Mr. Serjeant *Ball.*] Not so much difference; now, do you know the rent paid by Michael Russell?—I do.

7999. What is it?—£. 8 late currency, all the houses in that row pay.

8000. Do you mean including Roach and Toole's?—I do.

8001. Do you know that fact?—I have the receipt of Toole's in the year 1832.

8002. And that was 8*l.*?—£. 8 late currency.

8003. And Russell's house the same?—Russell's wife lived there.

8004. Russell's wife paid the same rent?—Russell's wife lived there before Russell got married, and there was a large arrear of rent due; and in consequence of paying the arrear, he has it on a stamp receipt that he was to have it at 6*l.* a year, provided he paid up the arrear.

8005. Produce that receipt?—It is outside.

[*The Witness went and fetched it in.*]

8006. Have you got the document now that you spoke of?—I have.

8007. I understood you to state that Russell got the house at a rent of 6*l.*?—Provided he paid the arrears.

8008. Do you find that entered on that document?—I do.

8009. What is that document; you said it was a stamp receipt?—Yes, a stamp receipt.

8010. A stamp receipt for what?—For the rent and for the agreement.

8011. Read the stamp receipt for the rent first?—"Received, in part payment of arrears of rent, 1*l.* If Michael Russell pays up all the arrears due for his house, he is to be allowed it at the rent of 6*l.* sterling per annum for the term of his own life and during the life of his present wife; but in case of non-payment thereof, he is to be charged 8*l.* a year. Signed, *Ann Grubb.*"

8012. She was the landlady?—Yes.

8013. Was that 8*l.* present currency, or late currency?—Late currency.

8014. How much is that in the present currency?—£. 7. 7*s.*, I believe.

8015. *Chairman.*] What is the date of this; look at it?—The 9th of October 1824.

8016. What would be the difference of the currency?—It is about 12*s.* 8*d.* less; 12*s.* 4*d.* or 8*d.*

8017. Well, how much are you to deduct from the rent you stated to be due, considering the difference of the currency; taking it first of all at 6*l.* and then at 8*l.*?—Twelve shillings and four-pence off 8*l.*; 7*l.* 7*s.* 8*d.*

8018. Then the 8*l.* was 7*l.* 7*s.* 8*d.*?—Yes, I think so; very near that.

8019. And that receipt is dated in October 1824?—Yes.

8020. How much arrears of rent were due?—I do not know.

8021. Mr. Serjeant *Ball.*] But it appears from that document they were to be paid by instalments?—Yes, they pay them yearly.

8022. Now, you know that the rent of all those houses, namely, Dooley's, Michael

Michael Russell's, and Roach and Toole's, that the rent of all those houses was the same, namely, 8*l.*?—There are two or three more the same. Mr. Dennis Walsh.

8023. Which are they?—There is a man of the name of Carew, he is dead; and there is a man named Napper. 1 May 1837.

8024. Is Napper on the register now?—Yes, he was registered by Mr. Hobson.

8025. Then he is a voter?—He is.

8026. And who else?—I do not know; I do not exactly recollect who the other persons were.

8027. Is there any one now who has registered out of the house occupied by William Carew formerly?—No.

8028. But Napper registered before Mr. Hobson?—Yes.

8029. And his house pays 8*l.*?—All the same.

8030. All in a row?—All in a row.

8031. And is Napper's house better than the others, or worse?—No, just the same.

8032. I believe the value of Napper's house has not been impugned by the witnesses on the other side?—I do not know; I was not here.

8033. Do you happen to know how Napper voted?—He voted for Mr. Bagwell.

8034. Napper voted for Mr. Bagwell?—He did.

8035. And you have not heard that the value of his house has been impeached?—I did not hear it was.

8036. Mr. Lefroy.] You know nothing about it I suppose?—

8037. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] It was not one of the houses that were specified by the witnesses who have appeared here for the purpose of cutting down the value?—I do not suppose that they cut down one of their own.

8038. And you are quite clear that Napper's house is not better than any of the others?—They are all the same, with the exception of Russell's, he has a third room in his. There were two very large rooms, and Russell divided one of the large rooms, and made two rooms of it.

8039. And also, with this difference, that Russell's garden is longer and better?—Russell's garden goes down long-ways, and the other cross-ways.

8040. So that, would you say from what you have stated, that if there is a difference at all between Russell's and the other houses that have been described, it would be in favour of Russell's?—Russell's is much nearer than any of them.

8041. Not only nearer, but there is an additional room above, and a greater length of garden?—I think it is just as valuable as the others; there is only the little difference of a few feet of garden.

8042. And Napper, who voted for Mr. Bagwell, was registered by Mr. Hobson?—He was.

8043. So that I may substantially say, the difference between the value of Napper's and Russell's houses, that we are now endeavouring to sustain, is this: that Napper, at the election, voted for Mr. Bagwell, and that Russell voted for Mr. Ronayne?—Yes.

8044. You are not of opinion that that makes any great difference in the intrinsic value of the house?—I do not think that makes any difference at all: it might make a difference in the way of voting, but not in the value.

8045. Now, I will just call your attention to the evidence of Mr. William Smith again, number 8573 question: "What did you state the value of Patrick Toole's house to be? Full 10*l.*" Now, after hearing that, have you any doubt, I ask you the question once more, that Russell's house is worth 10*l.*?—I think they are all the same, every one of those houses. I have been through the whole of them.

8046. Chairman.] You state, that in Michael Russell's house there are three rooms up stairs, I think?—There are.

8047. That one room was very large, and he divided it into two?—The two upper rooms were the same size, and Russell divided one of the rooms into two.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.
1 May 1837.

8048. He made three rooms out of two?—No, he did not touch them all, but divided one of the rooms; there is one at each side of the stairs, and he divided one of those.

8049. Well, now then, in Toole's house the rooms were not divided?—No nor in any of the houses; Napper's, Toole's, or any of them.

8050. Were the rooms in Toole's house the same size as the room in Russell's house, before it was divided?—The very same.

8051. At whose expense was the division made?—At Russell's.

8052. And when was the division made?—About eight years ago, he told me; it was when he got married.

8053. Let me look at that receipt again. [*It was handed to his Lordship.*] Now that receipt, I think, talks of the value of the house being about 7*l.* 4*s.* 8*d.* does it not?—Yes, 8*l.* late currency.

8054. That would be 7*l.* 4*s.* 8*d.*?—I believe it is 7*l.* 7*s.* 8*d.*

8055. In what currency is the value taken under the Reform Act?—Of course the British currency.

8056. Then, as far as the registry is concerned, this receipt goes to prove the house was worth 7*l.* 7*s.* 8*d.*?—At the time he got it; he had it a great many years.

8057. The registering value being 10*l.*?—Yes.

8058. Is the value of the house greater now or less than it was in 1824?—Of course it is of greater value now.

8059. Why so?—Because houses have got up considerably since the time when the Catholic question was settled; people have got more steady, and drawn their attention more to business. After the year 1829, they got up for three or four years.

8060. How much did they get up?—I do not know; they have risen in proportion.

8061. But what is the proportion?—There were some houses in Clonmel set, in 1822 and 1823, for 25 guineas, that now they got 40 guineas for them.

8062. Mr. *Hamilton.*] They have risen, in spite of the tithe question?—They have.

8063. Mr. *Serjeant Bell.*] You do not pay tithes in Clonmel?—No, I never did, nor never will, if I can help it.

8064. *Chairman.*] Are we to understand that houses in Clonmel have increased 75 per cent. in value since 1824?—I can only state there are houses, as I have stated, that were set, in 1822 and 1823, for 25 guineas, that they got 40 guineas for now.

8065. Do houses generally in Dispensary-street bring now 75 per cent. more than they did in 1824?—I do not think they will.

8066. Will they bring 20 per cent. more than they did in 1824?—I do not exactly know.

8067. Will they bring 10 per cent. more?—I think they will.

8068. You think they bring 10 per cent. more than they did in 1824?—Yes.

8069. Was there any back house in Michael Russell's yard?—One small one.

8070. Were there any back houses in Toole's yard?—Yes, I stated there were two.

8071. Are those back houses of any value?—Indeed they are; I suppose they keep potatoes and turf and so on in them.

8072. Are they of any value?—They are, of course.

8073. Then a house which has two back houses instead of one, is more valuable than that which has only one?—Yes; but the ground that was under those back houses Russell has (at least the quantity of ground he would have the back houses on) he has had tilled; turned into a garden.

8074. Will therefore the value of the land without the back houses be greater than with the back houses in it?—No, I do not think it is.

8075. What is the difference between the two?—They can make no great difference, those bits of back houses; they are very small.

8076. Then

8076. Then the back houses are as valuable, and not more so, than the land?—I do not think it would make 2s. 6d. a year difference in the value of the house.

8077. Now what is the size of the yard in the case of Michael Russell?—A small yard.

8078. Is that the same size exactly as Patrick Toole's?—No, Toole's is larger; but Russell has the yard; he has the ground that Toole has, at least he has the same quantity; he has tilled his, turned his into a garden.

8079. Then those cases come out to be this, that Russell has a smaller yard and a larger garden?—Yes.

8080. And Toole has a smaller garden and a larger yard?—Yes, precisely.

8081. Which way did Toole vote?—He did not vote at the first election at all.

8082. But did he vote at all at either election?—He voted at the last election for Mr. Ronayne.

8083. Then it appears a person named, who voted for Mr. Ronayne, may still have a house of the value of 10*l.*, by the evidence of Mr. Smith, does it not. It appears that, as Mr. Smith affirms Toole's house is worth 10*l.*, that Mr. Smith will now and then acknowledge a partisan of Mr. Ronayne may have a house worth 10*l.*?—I do not understand the question.

8084. Do not you admit now that Toole voted for Mr. Ronayne once?—He did.

8085. And has it not appeared that Mr. William Smith admits Toole to have a house worth 10*l.*?—He does.

8086. Does it not therefore appear from those two circumstances that Mr. William Smith does not undervalue all houses held by the supporters of Mr. Ronayne?—By that of course he has not.

8087. Is the house thatched or slated?—Slated.

8088. Both of them?—Both of them.

8089. You do not know the valuation of the two houses, do you, in the commissioners' book?—I do not.

8090. Mr. Serjeant *Bail.*] Now you were asked with respect to that document I understood the question to be, whether that was not evidence of the value in the year 1824 being only 8*l.* Irish? Now I ask you whether you mean to say that that is evidence of anything more than that the rent paid for the premises was 8*l.* Irish?—£. 8 Irish.

8091. But do you mean to say that that was the value of the premises, or that it is evidence of the value of the premises in the year 1824?—I do not know.

8092. In other words, you do not consider that rent and value are synonymous?—I do not.

8093. And accordingly, although that document ascertains the rent payable for the premises was 8*l.* Irish, it does not ascertain that that was the value?—No, it does not; I know several landlords in Clonmel that get as much rent for the houses they set as they can.

8094. Now, you were asked this moment whether, from what you heard of Mr. William Smith's evidence, it did not appear that he could occasionally admit that a man who voted for Mr. Ronayne lived in a house worth 10*l.* a year; now, will you attend to this part of his evidence, and tell me whether you cannot account for his admitting in this instance the property was worth 10*l.*, without supposing him to have strained himself much with a view to being impartial. Just attend to this: at Question 3429, he was asked, "Do you know the house of Patrick Roach and Patrick Toole? I do.—Do they occupy the same house?—The same house; both registered out of the same house.—Describe the house? It consists of two rooms and a kitchen on the ground floor; two rooms up stairs; there is a good sized yard, a garden, and two back houses built on the yard.—Are they offices? They are, such as turf houses or potato houses; I consider that the full value is 10*l.*—What is the size of the garden? It is about 20 feet by 14, as near as I can say; I cannot speak positively to it, but I consider the premises worth 10*l.*, and the only objection to it, that

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

1 May 1857.

that was the two voting out of one house of the value of 10*l*." And then he goes on, "Were they both registered at the same registration? Without referring to the book, I could not tell; I rather think they were registered at one time.—Then they proved the house of the value of 20*l*.? No, not more than the value of 10*l*.—How do you mean that both registered, then? Patrick Roach was tenant, and he went up and got registered; he let part of it to Toole, and he registered also.—In your opinion, in order to qualify two to register, the house ought to have been worth 20*l*. instead of 10*l*.? In my opinion it ought." Now, do you observe from that evidence, that Mr. William Smith had what he considered a very good objection, and one much easier to sustain, namely, a double register by two persons out of a house worth only 10*l*, and that, accordingly, it was quite unnecessary for him to resort to the first objection, which it was difficult to sustain, namely, that the house was not of the value of 10*l*; accordingly, do you see in that circumstance any reason why Mr. Smith should not have found it necessary to prove that that house was not of the value of 10*l*.?—I do not exactly understand the question.

8095. Do you understand this, that the objection made by Mr. Smith to this registry was, that two persons registered out of the same house; do you understand that?—I do.

8096. If that objection were allowed, do not you see that it was unnecessary for him to establish the other objection, namely, that the house was not worth 10*l*.; do not you see that?—I do not understand the question.

8097. Are you aware of this, that two persons are not entitled to register out of one house which is only worth 10*l*. a year?—I do not think they are entitled to register.

8098. Now if you found two persons who supported Mr. Bagwell registering out of one house worth only 10*l*. a year, would you not insist that those were had votes?—I would.

8099. On the other hand, if two persons registered out of a house worth 20*l*. a year, the case might be different?—It might.

8100. Then each would have a house of the value of 10*l*. supposing the house were divided into two?—Yes.

8101. Now if that be so, that where the house is worth only 10*l*., two persons are not entitled to register out of it?—They are not.

8102. Why then was it not immaterial whether the house was worth 10*l*. or worth less than 10*l*. in this instance?—Indeed it was.

8103. Perfectly immaterial?—Perfectly immaterial.

8104. Therefore Mr. William Smith could not consider himself as at all coerced or influenced even to prove that the house was not worth 10*l*., when, even if it be worth 10*l*., the registry must have been had, because two registered out of the one house; do you understand?—I do.

8105. Is not that so?—Yes, it is.

8106. Accordingly, in other words, Mr. Smith (supposing him to be a most impartial man) had no interest in this case to represent this house of Roach and Toole to be worth less than 10*l*.; is not that so?—It is.

8107. *Chairman.*] In point of fact did Roach and Toole vote out of that house, No. 17, Dispensary-street?—No, not at the first election; Toole did not vote at the first election; he did at the last.

8108. Did Roach vote at the first election?—Never; he was in goal at the time.

8109. He voted at no election whatever?—No.

8110. Mr. Serjeant *Bell.*] Do you know the house of Paul Winbury in Catherine-street?—I do.

Jovis, 4^o die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Lord Granville Somerset.
Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Serjeant Jackson.
Sir Robert Ferguson.
Mr. Hogg.

Mr. Lefroy.
Mr. O'Connell.
Mr. M. J. O'Connell.
Mr. Milnes Gaskell.
Mr. Serjeant Ball.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Dennis Walsh, called in; and further Examined.

8111. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] ON the last day, I think, I was examining you as to the value of certain houses, the valuation put upon them?—Yes. *Mr. Dennis Walsh.*
8112. The last question I think I asked you was, with respect to the premises belonging to Paul Winbury; do you recollect that?—Yes. 4 May 1837.
8113. In Catherine-street?—Yes.
8114. Do you know that house?—I do.
8115. Is that one of the houses that you visited for the purpose of valuation?—It is.
8116. Immediately before your coming over here?—Yes; and in 1833 too.
8117. Was that upon the occasion of the petition?—It was.
8118. Can you describe those premises?—I can.
8119. Well, will you do so?—It is a very good sized house; there is a parlour and a kitchen on the first floor, and two large bedrooms over head; and there is a large yard, a slaughter-house and a pig-house.
8120. Is Winbury a butcher?—He is.
8121. Do you know what rent he pays?—I had his receipts in the year 1833, when I came up here.
8122. Have you got them about you now?—I have not; I returned them as soon as I went back.
8123. You had them in 1833?—Yes; and I returned them when I went back.
8124. Then you are able to state, from recollection, what the rent was he paid at that time?—Yes; 11*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.*
8125. Do you know whether he paid that rent in 1831; what years were those receipts for, as far as you recollect?—I had four or five or six of them.
8126. Were they for any period anterior to 1833?—They were; they were for 1828, 1829 and 1830, and 1832. I know I had five or six.
8127. Then you are able to state, from a recollection of those receipts, what was paid?—Yes.
8128. What was it?—*£.* 11. 7*s.* 6*d.*
8129. Now, did you know the house in 1831?—I have known this Winbury's house for the last 15 years.
8130. Mr. Hamilton.] What is the number in the street?—I do not know; there are a great many of the houses that are not numbered at all. It is a small street, and until the last two or three years the houses in Cloamul have not been numbered at all.
8131. What is the name of the street?—Catherine-street.
8132. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] It is stated in the evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins to be No. 6.
8133. Mr. Hamilton.] Does Paul Winbury hold more than one house?—No, he does not.
8134. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now, what do you consider the value of that house at the present day?—I think it is worth the same to-day; in fact it is in better order; he has built a slaughterhouse there.
8135. You think it is worth the same now as it was then?—The same as it was in the year 1828 and 1830.
8136. What

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

8136. What did you say was the value then?—Ten pounds ten shillings, British.

8136^a. That was the rent?—Yes.

8137. Do you consider that is under the value?—I think it is about the value.

8138. Now be so good as attend to this evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins. (No. 2854). "Do you know Paul Winbury?—I do. Do you know his house?—Yes, it is 6, Catherine-street. What is the value of it?—Six or seven pounds a year at the outside." Now do you agree in opinion with Mr. Joseph Higgins that that house is worth only 6 *l* or 7 *l*. at the outside?—I do not.

8139. Mr. *Lefroy*.] Were you acquainted with the handwriting to these receipts which you say you had?—No, I was not. It was a Mr. George Graham that received the rent for Miss Flannagan.

8140. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Was that Mr. George Graham the witness who was examined here?—Yes; it is Mr. George Graham; he received the rent for Miss Flannagan; there was some dispute about the property, and I know Mr. George Graham was the agent.

8141. He was also a witness in 1833, I think?—He was; he was one of the witnesses in 1833.

8142. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Can you state whether it is within the limits of the valuation of 1828?—I cannot.

8143. *Chairman*.] Take that book in your hand; what does Paul Winbury's house appear valued at in the commissioners' valuation?—Six pounds.

8144. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Is it the same house?—It is, there is no other Paul Winbury in the town.

8145. *Chairman*.] When you are talking of this rent, do you mean English money or Irish money?—£ 11. 7s. 6d. late currency.

8146. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] That is 10 guineas British?—Yes, 10 guineas.

8147. Do you know the premises of Thomas Hill, Upper Johnson-street?—I do.

8148. Did you examine those premises also?—I did.

8149. Will you describe those premises?—There is a shop and a parlour, and a back-house built by himself, and two rooms up stairs.

8150. Is that a good situation for business?—It is one of the best in the street.

8151. What is his business?—It is huxtering.

8152. Do you know what rent he pays?—Eight pounds.

8153. You know he pays 8 *l*. rent?—Yes, I saw some of his receipts.

8154. Now what value do you put upon that house?—It is very well worth 10 *l*. a year.

8155. You have no doubt of it?—I have no doubt at all of it.

8156. Mr. *Hamilton*.] You stated that the situation is a good one; do you mean that the street is a good street, or that that particular part of the street is good?—Upper Johnson-street is much narrower than Lower Johnson-street; there are a great many persons living there who carry on business, and there are a good many small streets, which enhance the value of the houses in that neighbourhood.

8157. You say it is a narrower street than Lower Johnson-street?—It is much narrower.

8158. *Chairman*.] Which houses are worth the most, the Upper or the Lower Johnson-street houses?—The houses in the Upper Johnson-street are not near so large as those in Lower Johnson-street; in Lower Johnson-street the houses are much larger.

8159. Take that book and point out to me where Thomas Hill is inserted in that valuation book, and see what he is rated at?—I do not see it here at all.

8160. Then, if his house do not appear in that register of the commissioners' valuation, it is presumed to be under 5 *l*. value, is it not?—There are a great many houses in Clonmel not valued at all that do not appear here.

8161. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] And that are more than 5 *l*.?—Yes, 10 *l*.

8162. I find the name of Hall here; I think that must be the house?—There is no Hall in that part of Clonmel.

8163. Repeat what you said in your former answer?—There are several houses that were not valued at all, paying 6 *l*, 7 *l*, 8 *l* and 9 *l* rent.

8164. That were not valued in that book?—Yes.

8165. *Chairman*.] Are there any houses within the commissioners' limits that

do not appear upon the valuation, and are still worth 10 l. a year?—There are several that pay 7 l. and 8 l. that do not appear.

8166. But are there any of 10 l. a year which do not appear?—There are several cellars paying over 10 l. that are not valued at all.

8167. Now state some of those?—Cornelius O'Neil's cellar is not in the commissioners' book.

8168. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Can you state whether the cellar is not taken into consideration in the value of the house in that case?—I do not know; I cannot state it, not of my own knowledge.

8169. *Chairman*.] Can you state any house, thereby meaning not a cellar, not a house which does not appear in the commissioners' book, of the value of 10 l.?—I cannot recollect of 10 l., but there are of 7 l. and 8 l.

8170. But 10 l. was my question?—I could not state.

8171. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Could you not state that this house we are now inquiring about, is worth 10 l.?—I can; this might be a mistake; Hall is marked here.

8172. But you know the fact that this house paid 8 l. a year rent at the time of the valuation?—Yes.

8173. Then, in that respect, speaking of this house, the book must be inaccurate?—Unless it is this, there is no such man as Hall living in Upper Johnson-street.

8174. I say the valuation-book must be incorrect in respect of this house, because if it paid 8 l. a year rent it ought, at all events, to have been included in the valuation?—It must be inaccurate.

8175. *Chairman*.] Supposing it to be Thomas Hall's house, what is that valued at?—Seven pounds.

8176. Mr. *Hamilton*.] You are aware that the valuation has been made upon oath?—I heard so; I am not aware of it; I heard it was; some of the valuers themselves told me so.

8177. There have been several sets of commissioners since 1828?—There have, three.

8178. They have acted upon the same valuation?—I believe they have; I cannot exactly say, for I was not a commissioner, and I do not think I was ever in their office.

8179. Was it a matter of complaint in Clonmel, that houses that should have been valued were not included in the valuation?—I did not hear it complained of.

8180. Was the feeling in Clonmel general, that the valuation was a high or a low valuation?—We always complain about taxes in the town.

8181. That is to say, you complained of its being high, do you mean that?—Yes.

8182. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Did you ever hear, either in Clonmel or anywhere else, of a person whose house or property was assessed to the taxes, complaining of its being too low?—I did not.

8183. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Are people likely to complain if others are omitted in a valuation?—I did not hear any person complain.

8184. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson*.] Would you not complain, if you yourself being rated, found others who had houses and who ought to be rated, were not rated?—I never did.

8185. But would you not think it a fair ground of complaint?—I heard one of the valuers say that they taxed the respectable persons more, so that they might lean lightly on the poor persons.

8186. My question to you is, if you yourself would consider it a fair ground of complaint, if you, being taxed, found others who occupied houses which ought to be taxed were omitted?—Of course I would.

8187. Do not you think other inhabitants in the town of Clonmel would feel in the same way, that they should bear the burthen which others ought to bear with them?—I am sure they would.

8188. And yet you never heard a complaint in the town that any others were omitted that ought to have been taxed?—I never did.

8189. Mr. *Hamilton*.] The valuation was exposed to public view when it was first made?—I believe it was some days open at least, that persons whom they did tax might come in and see it.

8190. Mr. *Hogg*.] You never saw that book before?—No, I did not.

8191. Did

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

4 May 1837.

8191. Did you ever see a book purporting to be a valuation, and similar to that book?—Never; I never recollect seeing it, except when I attended before in 1833.

8192. And you never heard a complaint made as to the valuation made by the valuers?—Except that they complained of being rated too high.

8193. Will you tell me your means of knowledge or means of information that enables you to state that there are a great number of houses paying 7*l.* and 8*l.* rent, not included in the valuation, you having stated you have never heard any complaint, and never seen any book purporting to be a copy of that valuation?—I heard different persons say, that such and such people ought to be taxed, and that it would be lightened on the respectable persons. I heard several persons say that cellars ought to be taxed.

8194. As you have generally adverted to the cellars, do you or not know whether the cellars are included in the valuation of the houses to which they are annexed?—They may; I cannot exactly say.

8195. You know nothing about it?—I do not.

8196. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] When you said you did not hear complaints, you did not mean to convey to us you had not heard observations?—No, because I heard several; I did not know what was meant by complaints; I never knew any person go and complain to the commissioners, except they went to look for a reduction.

8197. Mr. Hogg.] Did you ever ascertain the truth or the falsehood of any of these complaints, by finding out what the rent actually paid was, and whether the houses were or were not included in that book?—No; I cannot say I did.

8198. You never did yourself ascertain the truth or untruth of any such complaints?—No, I did not. I heard several persons complain that those paying 8*l.*, 10*l.*, 12*l.* and 14*l.* were not rated more than half that.

8199. Am I correct in stating this, that you cannot of your own personal knowledge state any one house paying upwards of 5*l.* rent, that is not included in that book?—I cannot from my own personal knowledge.

8200. I confine it to your own personal knowledge?—I do not know any thing about it.

8201. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] What do you say to this Thomas Hill?—I do not know whether that is his house or not.

8202. Supposing that should not be it, then the fact is, it is not in the valuation?—It is not.

8203. And he had paid 8*l.* a year rent?—Yes.

8204. Mr. Hamilton.] Can you point out in that valuation a single instance of a cellar that is rated separately?—I do not see a cellar here as far as I have gone, there are very few cellars in Johnson-street.

8205. So that as far as your personal knowledge goes, you are unable to point out a single instance of a cellar being rated separately?—Yes.

8206. Cast your eye over it, and see if you can point out an instance in those parts of the town you are acquainted with. There are cellars in Main-street, are there not?—Yes, that is what I am looking at, I do not see any of the cellars rated.

8207. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then I am to understand you, when you gave your former answer, that you had not heard any complaints of any persons who ought to be rated not being included in the valuation, or of any person whose premises ought to have been rated higher being rated too low, that you meant merely that you had not heard of any such complaints being made in a formal way to the commissioners?—I did not; but I heard several persons say that some were taxed more heavily than others, and others said that so and so were not rated so much as they ought to be.

8208. And also, as I collect, that some persons were not rated at all who ought to have been rated?—Yes; I did not hear them tell it to the commissioners, but I heard them speak of it.

8209. Then was it a common subject of conversation at the time?—It was.

8210. Mr. Hamilton.] Are you aware there is a power of appeal against the valuation, either on account of inadequacy or excess?—I heard so, but do not know it of my own knowledge.

8211. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now do you know the premises of Lawrence Cashin, in Upper Johnson-street?—I do.

8212. Can you describe those premises?—I can.

8215. Do

8213. Do so.—They consist of a shop, yard and back house, a parlour and bed-room on the first floor, with two rooms up stairs.

8214. Now is that in a good situation?—It is; it is in the same street as the other.

8215. Is it in a good part of the street, I mean?—Yes.

8216. What business is Lawrence Cashin in?—He sells huxtering and meal and flour.

8217. What do you estimate the value of that house?—I think it is very well worth 11 *l.* a year.

8218. Now be so good as turn to the valuation book, and see what is the valuation in the book. Is that the one to the present period?—It is.

8219. It includes the three valuations, does it not?—It does.

8220. Lawrence Cashin, Upper Johnson-street?—Mr. Keily, the clerk, is outside, and perhaps he will be able to find it much quicker than I can.

Mr. Keily, called in; and further Examined.

8221. *Chairman.*] TAKE that book first of all, turn to Upper Johnson-street, and see whether Lawrence Cashin is included in that book?—It is called here Mat. Cashin, but it should be Lawrence Cashin.

8222. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] What is the valuation of that house?—The valuation is 12 *l.*, and it is the same in the book of 1828.

8223. Now are you quite certain that they are the same premises?—I am quite certain.

8224. *Chairman.*] Now try if you can find out Thomas Hill in the same street?—In Upper Johnson-street, Thomas Hill.

8225. Is it Hill or Hill?—It is Hill, Upper Johnson-street.

8226. What is the value?—The value is 8 *l.*

Mr. Walsh's Examination resumed.

8227. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Now Mr. Walsh, with respect to Lawrence Cashin, do you know by whom he was registered?—He was registered by the late Mr. Hobson.

8228. Now, I am going to read you two or three questions and answers from the evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins (2864): "Do you know the house of Lawrence Cashin in the same street?—I do. Was he registered in 1832?—No; I think he was registered since. What do you suppose the value of his house to be?—*l.* 7 or *l.* 8." Now do you agree with Mr. Joseph Higgins, that that house which was valued in 1828 at 12 *l.* is worth only 7 *l.* or 8 *l.*?—I do not.

8229. Have you any doubt of it?—I have not. The late Mr. Hobson was very particular; he was obliged to have very good evidence, and there were two or three persons who came forward and proved that he would get 10 *l.* for the house, and that it was worth it, before Mr. Hobson would admit him.

8230. So that he was opposed before Mr. Hobson?—He was.

8231. And a discussion ensued and evidence was given on both sides?—Yes.

8232. Mr. *O'Connell.*] Was evidence given on both sides?—No, not on both sides.

8233. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Then the evidence was all in his favour?—Yes; in fact every registry in Clonmel at present is opposed; they oppose every person.

8234. Now do you know the premises of William Brown?—I do.

8235. They are in the same street?—Yes.

8236. Will you describe them?—He has a very good shop there.

8237. Well, what else?—Shop and parlour; and he has built a back house outside, he kills pigs; his back house concern has a very small yard where he kills pigs.

8238. Do you consider that a good situation in the street?—It is.

8239. Do you know what he was actually offered for those premises?—I do.

8240. What was it?—He was offered 10 *l.* a year, and 5 *l.* in hand.

8241. Mr. *O'Connell.*] As a fine?—Yes; I had it from the man who offered it to him.

8242. What is his name?—Patrick Fingan.

8243. Have you any doubt that those premises are worth 10 *l.* a year?—I have not; they would not be two days before they would be taken at 10 *l.* a year.

8244. Then, that being so, will you attend to this evidence of Mr. Higgins: (2879): "Do you know William Brown of the same street?—I do. What description of house does he inhabit?—It is a thatched house, and he keeps a little

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

4 May 1827.

a little shop. What value do you attach to it?—About 8 l." Now, do you agree in opinion with Mr. Higgins, that those premises for which 10 l. a year were offered, are worth only 8 l.?—I do not.

8245. And I suppose Mr. Finagan was not under that impression either, when he offered 10 l. a year for them?—No.

8246. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know the rent?—I can tell the rent; I believe it was 7 l. 10 s. He was also obliged to bring forward two persons before Mr. Hobson would register him; there were two very respectable persons brought forward to support him.

8247. Mr. O'Connell.] On what?—Yes.

8248. Mr. Hogg.] You say the rent was 7 l. 10 s.; when did he take the premises?—I cannot say; I knew him to be several years in the house.

8249. Mr. Hamilton.] Had he a lease?—I do not know.

8250. Mr. Hogg.] Who is his landlord?—I do not know.

8251. What was the occasion when this Patrick Finagan offered the 10 l. and the 5 l. fine?—Brown was going to live at Waterford; he was leaving Clonmel, and very likely has left it by this, and Finagan was in treaty for the house he lived in, and was going to carry on the same business there as Brown did, for they were both pig dealers.

8252. Who is it that has the disposing of the premises?—It is the tenant that has the disposing of it, not the proprietor.

8253. Has Brown a lease?—I do not know.

8254. If he has not a lease, how can he dispose of it?—There are several persons in Clonmel that have no lease that pay money to get into a concern for the good will of it.

8255. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Do you know what interest he has in it?—I do not.

8256. Mr. O'Connell.] He is at least a tenant from year to year?—He is.

8257. Mr. Hogg.] You neither know when his holding commenced, nor what the nature of his holding is?—I do not.

8258. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] How do you know he holds more than by the month?—I know it very well; he swore he was six months in possession.

8259. But still, how do you know he did not pay a monthly rent; heid monthly?—There are several persons in Clonmel, and generally speaking, many who have houses by the year pay their rent weekly.

8260. I am speaking of your knowledge in this particular case; how do you know that Brown has more than an interest from month to month or week to week?—I do not know, except what I heard him say.

8261. What did you hear him say?—I heard him say that he could dispose of his house.

8262. Did you hear him say whether his term was 10 years, 20 years, or one year, or six months?—I did not.

8263. Mr. Hamilton.] Had you any conversation with Finagan on the subject?—I had; he came into my house and wanted me to interfere; he wanted me to lend him some money.

8264. Do you know that it is a common practice in Ireland, in many places, to make offers for premises, with a view to enable a party who comes to register to say he was offered and refused such a sum?—I do not think it is.

8265. Have you never heard of that being done?—Not in our own town, Clonmel.

8266. Did you ever hear it was done anywhere?—I cannot say I did; I might have heard it; I do not recollect it.

8267. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did you ever hear of its being done after the registry, for the purpose of enabling a man to register?—I never did.

8268. This, if it occurred at all, was after the man registered?—Yes, it was.

8269. Mr. Hamilton.] When did it occur?—I suppose about a month before I came here.

8270. Who was he registered by?—He was registered by Mr. Howley.

8271. Then had you not a strong impression that this offer was not made for the purpose of enabling him to register in 1832?—It was long after the registry.

8272. Mr. Hogg.] It was about a month ago?—A month, or five or six weeks ago.

8273. And after the appointment of this Committee which is now sitting?—I cannot say that.

8274. Chairman.]

8274. *Chairman.*] Was it before or after Easter?—I believe it was after Easter. Mr. Davis Walsh.
8275. *Mr. Hogg.*] Did you or not hear in Clonmel of the appointment of this Committee?—I did. 4 May 1837.
8276. And that a considerable time before you got your summons to attend?—I did not know it until I had a letter from Mr. Serjeant Ball. I knew there was a Committee sitting with regard to Scotland, but I did not know about Clonmel. I read in the papers about Scotland.
8277. You read in the papers about Scotland?—I did.
8278. But nothing about Ireland?—I do not recollect seeing anything about Ireland.
8279. *Mr. Hamilton.*] You stated you employed yourself in going about to value houses, with a view to giving evidence?—Yes.
8280. Was it about the period you were doing that that this man had the conversation with you?—It was before that.
8281. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] I think I understood you to say that this Brown, you rather think, has left Clonmel and gone to Waterford?—He was going to reside at Waterford.
8282. And has Finagan taken the house?—I do not know; at the time I came here he was about the town.
8283. But at all events, you are clear upon this, that if Brown changed his residence and sold his interest to Finagan or any other person, Brown's vote would be gone?—Yes, certainly.
8284. Then do you think it likely that for the purpose of establishing a vote before this Committee, Brown would enter into a contract to change his residence and go about his business; is that likely?—No.
8285. *Mr. Hogg.*] Is he gone to Waterford?—I do not know. He was about leaving when I came here; Finagan was in treaty with him for the premises.
8286. But you do not know whether he is gone or not?—I do not.
8287. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Have you any doubt that that was a *bona fide* contract or treaty?—I have not the least doubt.
8288. Did you not say they both came into your house?—Yes.
8289. For what purpose?—Finagan wanted to get money from me.
8290. For what purpose?—In order to give it to Brown.
8291. Do you think all that, now, was a fiction?—I know very well it was not.
8292. *Mr. O'Connell.*] He had no claim on you for money?—No, the man is a customer of mine.
8293. What business are you?—In the spirit and grocery business.
8294. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] Are you a publican?—No.
8295. Do you retail spirits?—I do.
8296. *Mr. Hogg.*] You did not intend lending him the money?—I very often lent him money.
8297. Did you intend lending him money for this particular purpose?—If I had had it at the time, I would, because I often lent him money.
8298. Whether the interest he purported to sell, he had or not the power to sell, you made no inquiry of that sort?—I did not.
8299. *Mr. O'Connell.*] That was Finagan's own affair?—Yes, it was.
8300. *Mr. Morgan John O'Connell.*] He is a jobber?—Yes.
8301. And men in that business make a good deal of money, do they not?—Yes; I know one man in Clonmel that was not worth 40 l. some years ago, and he is worth 6,000 l. or 7,000 l. now.
8302. What is his name?—Patrick Feunelly.
8303. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Did he make that by dealing in pigs?—He did, every shilling of it. He is one of the most respectable bacon merchants now in Clonmel; at least, as respectable as any.
8304. *Chairman.*] Is his name Richard?—No, Patrick Feunelly.
8305. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Well, do you know the premises of Jeremiah Myers?—I do.
8306. In the same street, Upper Johnson-street?—I do.
8307. Will you describe those premises?—He has a very snug thatched house, he has a slaughterhouse, and about 24 perches of ground in the rear.
8308. Is he a butcher?—He is.
8309. What does he use the ground for?—He buys very extensively, and turns

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

4 May 1837.

in a lot of sheep; four, five or six sheep are there a day or two before he kills them; that is the use he makes of it now.

8310. Was that one of the houses that you examined for the purpose of valuation?—It was.

8311. Do you know the premises of Walter Bowles?—I do.

8312. Is there any ground attached to Bowles's house?—There is.

8313. Is there more or less ground attached to Myers's premises?—Myers has twice as much ground.

8314. In other respects are Bowles's premises more valuable in your judgment, or less valuable than Myers's?—They are less valuable; there is a house between Bowles and Myers, and the ground that ought to go with that house Myers has; and there is Murphy and Bowles, their houses are exactly the same.

8315. You have no doubt then, that Myers's premises are more valuable than Bowles's?—No doubt.

8316. Now, do you know by whom Bowles was registered?—I do.

8317. By whom?—By the late Mr. Hobson.

8318. Do you know what is Bowles's rent?—I do not know whether it is 6*l.* or six guineas.

8319. But it is the one or the other?—It is either the one or the other; he told me so himself.

8320. And you have no doubt, as you have stated, that Bowles's house is not so valuable as Myers's?—It is not.

8321. What do you say is the value of Myers's?—It is very well worth 10*l.* a year, and I have no doubt he would get it at once if he were to leave it.

8322. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Do you know the rent of Myers's house?—He told me it was 7*l.* 5*s.* present currency.

8323. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] You are quite certain he told you that?—I am.

8324. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Is it a thatched house?—It is.

8325. Two stories?—No.

8326. Does it usually happen that a one-story thatched house is worth 10*l.* a year?—There are several two-story thatched houses in Cloumel.

8327. Mr. *O'Connell.*] The question is, is it usual that a one-story thatched house is worth 10*l.* a year?—There are several. I know one thatched house in Cloumel, or at least within the borough, that pays 20*l.* a year.

8328. What accommodation is there in this house?—I think two rooms and a kitchen, as far as I can remember.

8329. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson.*] And only one story?—One story.

8330. That is, the ground floor?—The ground floor.

8331. Mr. *Hogg.*] What rent does the man pay?—£.7. 5*s.* present currency, he told me.

8332. And do you mean that the market value of the house, if it were to let to-morrow, is what you have stated?—I have no doubt he would get 10*l.* to-morrow for it.

8333. That is what you consider as the market value?—Yes, he told me himself he would not let it for 10*l.*

8334. Can you assign any reason why he should only pay 7*l.* 5*s.* for that which is of the marketable value of 10*l.*?—I own myself a house that I could get 11*l.* for, and I give for it 9*l.* The gentleman that I purchased it of gave it for 9*l.* and I left it so.

8335. The 11*l.* was not so well secured as the 9*l.*?—I was offered a year's rent in advance, and 11*l.* for it.

8336. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] And you preferred letting it for 9*l.*?—I did. The man that was in it was a very proper man, and I did not disturb him.

8337. Mr. *Hogg.*] That was an old holding?—No; they were three houses that were built six or eight years ago.

8338. And you found the tenant there when you made the purchase?—Yes, I did; he had no hold of the place though; he was a yearly tenant.

8339. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] Then in that instance, you would not say that rent and value were synonymous?—I would not. I know several landlords in Cloumel, that could get 2*l.* or 3*l.* a year more for their houses than they let them at. There is the greater part of the houses in the new street that Mr. Taylor, the quaker, would get 10 guineas for, and he gives them at eight guineas.

8340. Now, having stated that, will you attend to this evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins, (No. 2828): "Do you know Jeremiah Myers, Upper Johnson-street?"—He

—He lives next door to Walter Bowles, the house is the same description of house. Do you know the rent?—It is in better order and cleaner; I would say it is worth 7 l. a year. Do you happen to know that he has built upon the premises?—Yes, he is a butcher, and there is a little building. Built by him?—Built by him. Do you know the rent?—I should think the rent is about 6 l. a year, and I would say that 7 l. a year is about the value. I think if the place were to be let to-morrow, it would not bring more." Now, do you agree in opinion with Mr. Joseph Higgins as to those premises?—I do not.

8341. Do you agree in opinion with Mr. Joseph Higgins as to these matters I am now going to read to you; (No. 2806): "Do you imagine that a man pays for a house the extreme value of it to him?—I rather think he does. That is your idea of the value?—That is my idea in general." Do you concur with him in opinion in that respect?—I do not.

8342. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you mean then to say, that generally speaking, houses in Clonmel are let considerably under their value?—Some of them are.

8343. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now attend to this; (No. 2808). "Are houses all let at a rack-rent?—Not at a rack-rent. What do you mean by a rack-rent?—A rack-rent is the extreme value. You were understood to say that it was the practice to let houses at the extreme value? The practice is to get the full value for the premises, and I would call the rack-rent something beyond that. Something beyond the full value?—Something beyond the full marketable value. The practice is to let the houses at their full value, but not beyond the full value?—To let the houses at the full value. So that the tenants have no interest whatever in the house?—I think in general, in Clonmel the full value is paid for the premises. Then you draw the inference, that the tenant has no interest whatever in the house?—Unless he can make an interest by other means besides. Besides what?—Besides the mere house, unless he can add a value to it from the business which he follows in the house, and if you add to that, letting lodgings, he may derive an interest in that way; but I look upon that as distinct from the value of the house. Do you think that the convenience of a shop, for example, which enables a man to earn money, does not add to the value of the house?—I say that the circumstance of the shop enables the landlord of the house to get the value for it. Then rent and value in your opinion are synonymous?—Certainly, rent and value in my opinion are synonymous. I speak with respect to Clonmel." Now, do you agree in opinion with Mr. Joseph Higgins, in those particulars?—I do not.

8344. You do not consider rent and value synonymous in Clonmel?—I do not.

8345. Then you do not consider houses are let for their full value in Clonmel?—They are not; I can mention several instances in which they are not.

8346. You do not consider it the fact that the tenant has no interest whatever in the house?—I know he has an interest, generally speaking.

8347. Mr. Hogg.] When you say you know several instances, speaking generally, state generally whether, when houses are to be let in Clonmel, they are or are not let at their market value?—They are not.

8348. That is the general rule in Clonmel?—That is the general rule, there may be some few cellars and houses that poor people, such as publicans and people of that class live in, that they try to get the most they can for.

8349. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you mean by that the full value?—Yes, they try to get the most they can from those poor people, but generally speaking, the people in Clonmel do not get value for the house and cellars they let.

8350. Mr. Hogg.] Generally speaking, they are let from 25 to 30 per cent. under the market value?—I will not say that.

8351. From 20 to 25, the difference between 7 l. and 10 l.?—But this man has had this house a long time, and he built a slaughterhouse.

8352. I am not speaking of an individual house, but the general rule in Clonmel; is it that houses are let about 20 or 25 or 30 per cent. under the market value?—I do not exactly say that, but there are several houses that have been set under their value.

8353. I am asking as to the general rule; can you or not state the general rule?—They do not get the value, generally speaking; they could get much more for them if they choosed.

8354. But, generally speaking, they are let considerably under the market value?—Not considerably, something under the value.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

4 May 1837.

8355. Do you mean by that the difference between 7 and 10?—I know there are some houses that are let at 8 l. that the landlord could readily get 10 l. for, that that is the market value. I could name several landlords in Clonmel who give their houses much less, 40 s. a year less, than they could get for them.

8356. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Name some?—Sir Richard Jones's son, he is an architect; he has built a new street, called Wollington-street, he sets all those houses at 8 l. 10 s., and he could readily get 10 guineas for them. I have it from his foreman. And I have no doubt, from the way I know the houses are set in Clonmel, he could readily get 10 guineas.

8357. Mr. Hamilton.] Were those houses set separately?—Separately.

8358. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And he is, you say, an architect?—He is.

8359. Of course, therefore, more competent than probably many others would be to determine the proper value of a house?—I have heard him say he got proper tenants there, and he thought he had a right to give it to them; or at least I heard his foreman say, that he would rather give it them at less, to enable them to pay the rent, than get a greater rent.

8360. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Comparing greater rents and lesser rents, do the landlords in Clonmel give the preference to tenants of equal solvency at the lower rate than the higher?—I say I would rather to-morrow, and I have myself set some places in Clonmel, I would rather to-morrow give it to a good tenant at less than I would give it to another at more.

8361. But suppose two persons of equal solvency proposed to you for premises, the one offered 10 l. a year, and the other 7 l. or 7 l. 10 s., which would you prefer letting to?—I would prefer getting the 10 l. a year.

8362. And do you think the other landlords in Clonmel agree with you in that prudential view?—I know very well the landlords in Clonmel could get more than they do. I know several; there is Mr. Jones, he could get as good tenants as the tenants he has, and he could get 10 guineas for what he now gives for 8 l. 10 s.

8363. If two persons of equal solvency proposed to you, you would prefer giving the premises to a man for 10 l. a year rather than 7 l. 10 s., both being equally solvent?—Yes.

8364. May I ask; do the other landlords in Clonmel entertain the same prudential views as you do, or do they differ from you in that?—I do not know.

8365. You cannot form an opinion?—I cannot; I know several landlords in Clonmel who could get more for their premises than they do.

8366. Do you think landlords in Clonmel differ from mankind in all other parts of the world?—No, I do not.

8367. And do you think it is the general rule of mankind to prefer letting their premises at a lower rent than can be obtained from persons of equal solvency?—I know I could name several landlords that could get much greater rents than they do.

8368. From persons equally solvent?—Yes.

8369. And who prefer letting at the low rent?—Yes; I can name one.

8370. Do?—Mr. Bagwell.

8371. And you know he prefers letting to persons of equal solvency at the lower rent rather than the higher?—I do. I know Mr. Bagwell could get 25 or 30 per cent. more for some houses in Clonmel than he is getting.

8372. From persons of equal solvency?—Yes.

8372.* Mr. O'Connell.] Will a man, occupying a house of equal rank, such as a 10 l. house, he equally solvent when he pays 10 l. a year, as he will be when he only pays 8 l.?—He will not.

8373. Mr. Hamilton.] Now, with respect to Mr. Bagwell's houses, was it that the people in Clonmel are disposed to offer a larger rent than the value of the houses, or that the landlord, Mr. Bagwell, is disposed to accept a less sum than what you consider the value of the houses?—Mr. Bagwell gives his supporters houses much cheaper than he gives to those who are opposed to him.

8374. Then Mr. Bagwell is a particular instance?—I know several other persons.

8375. He gives them under value for a particular purpose?—He does give them under value of course.

8376. Chairman.] Did not some of Mr. Bagwell's tenants vote against them?—I cannot say that they did, those immediately holding under him; I do not know they did. Yes, there were some; I know one.

8377. Are

4 May 1837.

8377. Are those still his tenants?—They are, but they had leases from him.
8378. What were their rents?—The house I allude to was built by the man himself, or by his father; he paid but 3 l. a year for it.
8379. What is that worth?—I suppose worth 50 l. a year.
8380. Then the 3 l. is the ground rent, not the rent of the house?—Yes, the ground rent.
8381. Mr. *Morgan John O'Connell*.] Is it a long lease?—I believe 999 years.
8382. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Would the corporation give the freedom at all to any person in the liberal interest?—They never gave it in Clonmel as long as I recollect, except to one, and that was Mr. Stephen Lonergan.
8383. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] I believe that was the other day?—It was.
8384. And is not his claim disputed?—It is; he was opposed by the liberal party.
8385. And was the opposition successful?—No.
8386. Mr. *Hawilton*.] So that he was admitted by the conservatives and opposed by the liberals, being a liberal himself?—He was admitted in consequence of serving his time to Mr. Duckett, an attorney.
8387. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Is Lonergan a liberal?—He is.
8388. Mr. *Hogg*.] Is there much competition for houses in Clonmel?—There is indeed, in some parts of the town.
8389. *Chairman*.] In Upper Johnson-street is there much competition?—Upper and Lower Johnson-street, indeed all the houses in both Johnson-streets are set.
8390. Is there much competition in Upper Johnson-street, for houses in that situation?—All the houses in Johnson-street are set.
8391. Then supposing there was one to be wanted, would there be much competition?—Indeed there would be a good many looking for it.
8392. Who would be anxious to take it?—There would indeed.
8393. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] You stated, I think, that Walter Bowles was registered by Mr. Hobson?—He was.
8394. And you have already told us that Mr. Hobson was extremely particular and very hard to please, with reference to value?—Very particular indeed; both himself and Mr. Howley.
8395. Have you told us what was the rent of Jeremiah Myers's house?—£. 7. 5 s.; that is what he told me.
8396. Bowles's rent was 6 l.?—Six pounds or guineas.
8397. I find here, No. 2016 of Mr. Higgins's evidence, "What is Bowles's rent?—Bowles told me his rent was 6 l. a year. I think Myers's is about the same." That is Mr. Higgins's evidence; how do you know that Myers's rent is 7 l. 5 s.?—He told me so.
8398. Then taking Bowles's rent to be 6 l. as stated there, and Myers's 7 l. 5 s. as stated by you, which of the two houses do you consider the more valuable?—There is a very good slaughterhouse in this; and he has double the quantity of ground; Myers has double the quantity that Bowles has.
8399. Then the result is this, do you consider Myers's house worth 10 l. a year?—I do.
8400. You have no doubt about it?—I have no doubt about it; I am quite sure he would get it to-morrow if he left it.
8401. Now do you know the house of Edmund Day?—I do.
8402. In Upper Johnson-street?—I do; he lives next door to Myers.
8403. Well, is that house pretty much like the other you have been describing?—No.
8404. Well, what is that, will you describe that?—That is a larger house.
8405. Larger than Myers's?—Yes; there is a kitchen and parlour on the first floor, and there are three rooms up stairs; there is an up stairs in that house, and there is not in the other; and there are about 12 perches of ground; there is as much ground to that as there is to Bowles's, exactly.
8406. Then this is in some respects a better house than Myers's?—It is.
8407. Now, what value do you put on that house?—The man pays 9 l. for it.
8408. Rent?—Yes.
8409. Mr. *Hawilton*.] How do you know that?—I was at the sessions when he registered; there were two persons sworn to it. His landlord is Mr. Aldwell. It was Mr. Howley that registered him; he was obliged to have one or two persons,

Mr. Denis Walsh.

4 May 1837.

as well as I recollect, to prove the value of the house, that it was worth 10*l.* before he would register him.

8410. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And how do you know his rent is 9*l.*?—He told me so himself.

8411. Did you hear it stated?—It was sworn to in the court-house; he swore to it himself that he paid 9*l.*

8412. Now, have you any doubt that those premises are good value for 10*l.* a year?—I have not.

8413. Then, when Mr. Joseph Higgins states, in No. 2928, "What value do you presume it to be of?—The man pays 8*l.* 10*s.* a year rent;" that is not accurate?—No; 9*l.* he told me.

8414. Again, in 2929, when Mr. Joseph Higgins is asked, "Do you adhere to your former notion that Day's house is not worth more than you state it? I merely state the rent he pays, which I think is about the value, I think that is the value of his house;" do you agree in opinion with Mr. Higgins as to that?—I do not.

8415. Do you consider that the house would let for what you state, 10*l.* a year?—I am quite sure it would; I have no doubt about it.

8416. Mr. Hogg.] Do you think the persons you have spoken of as generally occupying houses that might be let for 2*l.* or 3*l.* more than they paid; do you think that these houses, if let at that advanced rent, that the occupiers of such houses would thrive in their respective trades and businesses, and be able to pay their rent at the advanced rent you mention?—I know they would.

8417. You have no doubt they would?—I have no doubt they would; no doubt of it at all.

8418. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You stated that in one instance, where you let a house for 2*l.* less than what you call the market value, that you did so in order that the tenant might be solvent?—I could have got a tenant equally solvent.

8419. Am I right in stating your answer?—No, not exactly; I said that I let the man in, and I could have got 11*l.* from another tenant, giving me a year's rent in advance, and not to require it until the last year he would be leaving the house.

8420. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] But the landlords generally, in Clonmel, in letting their houses 2*l.* or 3*l.* under the real value, are actuated solely by feelings of benevolence, and not with reference to their own interest?—I think the landlords in Clonmel, those that I mentioned to you, and I could mention more, do not wish to get those great rents.

8421. Then, if they could get 2*l.* or 3*l.* more from tenants equally solvent, am I right in stating that they are actuated solely by feelings of benevolence, and not with reference to their own interest or the safety of their rent?—Of course they are.

8422. And that is your opinion?—It is my opinion that the landlords in Clonmel do not get as much as they could get for their houses.

8423. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you not think that benevolence and self-interest may very well go in the same channel in many instances?—Yes.

8424. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Do you think the landlords of Clonmel are more benevolent than the landlords of other places?—I think, generally speaking, that landlords having property in towns are much more benevolent than country landlords.

8425. Or the landlords in other towns?—I cannot speak to other towns.

8426. Mr. Hamilton.] Mr. Higgins is a landlord in Clonmel, I believe, is he not?—No, I did not hear that he was; he has got a house there, and he got some few acres of ground from Mr. Bagwell the other day. I saw him registering his land. I do not know that he has any houses.

8427. Mr. O'Connell.] He is the tenant then, and not the landlord of that house he held?—I did not hear that Mr. Higgins had any property in Clonmel.

8428. Mr. Hamilton.] Is Mr. Malcolmson a landlord?—Yes, I think he is; he has not much property in houses, I believe.

8429. He holds a good deal of property?—No, I believe not; he employs his money in trade. I think he has very little house property in Clonmel; he may have some, but not much. The principal persons who are landlords in Clonmel are Mr. Bagwell, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Morton, and Mr. Jones the architect, and Mr. Morgan Jones too.

8430. Mr. Hogg.] Are there in Clonmel many intermediate landowners, or householders

householders or house owners, intermediate between the four and five gentlemen you have named as the actual occupiers?—There are.

8431. What they call middlemen?—Yes, there are some.

8432. How many middlemen in Clonmel are there who hire houses for the purpose of letting them out again and making a profit?—I do not know; I know there is one landlord in particular (Mr. Morgan Jones) who had houses in a street there, and he preferred taking them into his own possession; he used to set them to middlemen, and he has now taken them into his own possession.

8433. But are there not many middlemen in Clonmel?—There are; there are middlemen of course.

8434. Are these middlemen equally benevolent in letting for 20 or 30 per cent. under the market value?—Of course they do not set as cheap as the landlords.

8435. Are half the houses in Clonmel held under middlemen?—I do not know.

8436. From your local knowledge, according to the best of your belief, as you have spoken of so much local knowledge, can you form a reasonable conjecture, would you say half or a third are held under middlemen?—I do not think half are.

8437. Do you think a third?—I could not take on me to say; I would not like to say; I could almost name all the landlords.

8438. Is it your belief that a third of the occupation tenants hold from middlemen?—I would not take upon me to say.

8439. It may or may not be so?—It may or may not; I could not answer that.

8440. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Do you know the premises of John Bagg, in Upper Johnson-street?—I do.

8441. Now will you describe those premises?—

8442. *Chairman*, to Mr. *Keily*.] Look at the valuation book of the commissioners, and state what the houses of Brown, in Upper Johnson-street, and Myers and Day, what are their several values in that book?—William Brown's house is valued at 5 *l*.

8443. *Chairman*.] Myers?—Jeremiah Myers, 6 *l*.

8444. Day?—Eight pounds.

8445. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*, to Mr. *Walsh*.] You told me, I think, that Myers pays 7 *l*. a year rent?—£ 7. 5 *s*.

8446. And you have heard he is valued in that book at 6 *l*?—Yes.

8447. You likewise told me William Brown paid, what rent?—I think, 7 *l*. 10 *s*. I told you.

8448. And you have heard he is valued there at only 6 *l*?—Yes.

8449. Do you consider that that valuation has any claim to the character of accuracy, after what you have stated?—I know it has not.

8450. That it is very inaccurate?—Very inaccurate, indeed.

8451. Palpably so?—Perfectly so.

8452. Mr. *Hamilton*.] You, as a rate-payer, and all the other rate-payers, I suppose, were much aggrieved by the under valuation with reference to those persons?—At the next time we will take very good care; I know the majority of the people in Clonmel will take very good care; we will have the town re-valued next July.

8453. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Then is it the intention of the inhabitants to insist upon a new valuation?—Yes, I should suppose it is; I have no doubt they will insist upon it.

8454. *Chairman*, to Mr. *Keily*.] What is John Bagg's house valued at?—That is valued at 7 *l*.

8455. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*, to Mr. *Walsh*.] I read to you that Mr. Higgins admitted that the rent of Myers's house was from 6 *l*. to 7 *l*?—Yes; and he admits afterwards it was worth 1 *l*. more than Bowles's.

8456. He says 1 *l*. or 1 *l*. 10 *s*. more?—Yes.

8457. Now, if that be so, is it not your judgment, as the result of Higgins's evidence, that that valuation-book is inaccurate?—Clearly inaccurate.

8458. Does not Mr. Higgins put 7 *l*. 10 *s*., or more, upon Myers's house, which appears to be only 6 *l*. value in that book?—Yes.

8459. Mr. Serjeant *Jackson*.] Are you aware there is an appeal given to the inhabitants in case of any improper value?—At the time that the town was

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

4 May 1837.

valued the inhabitants did not know anything about it; they thought they could not interfere, the corporation having everything their own way at that time; they thought they could not interfere, and they only put on, I believe, three or four Catholics out of a population of about 16,000.

8460. Mr. Serjeant *Baill*.] What is the number of the commissioners?—I believe it is 21.

8461. And they put on three or four Catholics?—Yes. We did not understand the Act of Parliament; we thought, as usual, the corporation had the doing of everything, and we took no part in it.

8462. Mr. Serjeant *Jackson*.] Do not you know the commissioners, under the 9th of Geo. 4, had nothing to do with the corporation at the time?—At the time we did not.

8463. Are you such flat people in Cloamell that you do not know?—We did not know at the time, for the corporation took on them to name the commissioners without consulting the inhabitants at all.

8464. *Chairman*.] In 1828?—Yes. I do not know that they called a public meeting for it; they appointed them one by one.

8465. There have been two elections of commissioners since?—Yes.

8466. Are the same persons who are now commissioners the same individuals who were in the year 1828?—No, they are not.

8467. They are not the same persons that were in 1828?—No.

8468. Are they of the same politics?—No, they are not.

8469. How long have they been in office, these last commissioners?—Some of them, I believe, six years.

8470. But still, in spite of that, they have been perfectly contented with the valuation as they found it?—I believe they were.

8471. And how long have you been aware of all those houses being under value?—I heard it spoken of within the last 12 or 18 months.

8472. Not more than that?—I do not recollect.

8473. Then have you had any opportunity, for those 12 or 18 months, of making any appeal to these commissioners as to the under value of these houses?—You cannot do it except once, I believe, in every three years; that is as well as I know; I do not know it myself; it is only what I heard, that it must be when the commissioners are elected, that within some few days after you must come in and lodge an appeal; I do not think it is in the power of the inhabitants to appeal after the first few days.

8474. They do mean to avail themselves of it next July?—Yes.

8475. Mr. *Hamilton*.] You stated there were only three Roman-catholic gentlemen?—Either three or four.

8476. In 1828?—Yes.

8477. Can you state how many there are now?—A great many.

8478. Can you state how many Protestants there are now?—In the year 1831?

8479. No, now at this moment?—There were two sets of commissioners in the year 1831, the commissioners that were appointed then were several Roman-catholics and Protestants and Quakers; and as the majority of them were not Protestants or Quakers, they refused to act, with the exception of two.

8480. Mr. Serjeant *Baill*.] Who was the Quaker that refused to act?—Mr. William White.

8481. All the others you say refused to act?—Yes, as they had not a majority of their own party.

8482. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Can you state who refused to act?—Mr. James Burt is one, Mr. Malcolmson is another.

8483. Mr. Serjeant *Baill*.] Is that the gentleman we have heard so much of?—Yes.

8484. And who else?—I was not by, it is what I heard.

8485. It was the talk of the town?—It was. Mr. Edmond Power was another. Mr. Vowell acted, and Mr. Labarte acted.

8486. Do you mean to say they acted for some time and afterwards resigned?—Yes.

8487. Mr. *Hamilton*.] By whom did you hear it said that they refused to act because there was not a majority of Protestants?—Mr. Burke himself told me he would not act.

8488. Did he give you any reason?—He said, while those blackguard attorneys were

were on the commission he would have nothing to do with it. Those were the words he made use of. Mr. Dennis Walsh.

8489. Who were the attorneys that were on the commission?

8490. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Were they not Catholics?—No, they were not.

8491. Mr. Hamilton.] Then he did not say anything about objecting to act because there was not a majority of Protestants?—No, not to me.

8492. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did he to any one else?—I cannot say.

8493. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Who did to you?—Mr. Burke said to me he would not act while those blackguard attorneys were on the commission.

8494. Who was the person that told you he would not act because the majority were not Protestants?—I heard several of the commissioners say it: I heard Mr. John Butler say it.

8495. Tell me the name of any person who did tell you that was the reason?—I said I heard it about the town; I mentioned one, Mr. Butler, and he is here.

8496. He told you that was the reason?—That he heard so.

8497. Did any one else tell you?—Several told me so in Clonmel; I heard it spoken of at the News-room.

8498. Mention anybody else that you heard say so?—I think I heard Mr. Hackett say so.

8499. Who is he?—The proprietor of the "Tipperary Free Press."

8500. Is he here?—He is.

8501. But none of the gentlemen themselves who declined to act assigned you that reason?—No.

8502. And those who did assign reasons assigned reasons of a very different kind?—Yes.

8503. And yet your opinion is, they all resigned because they had not a majority of Protestants?—I have no doubt that that was what induced them.

8504. Is it your impression that if that was the motive that induced them to resign, it was a motive that they would be likely to conceal rather than profess openly?—They profess it at Clonmel; they do not try to conceal it at Clonmel at all.

8505. Mr. O'Connell.] What is it they do not conceal?—The town is divided into two parties.

8506. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you think it more likely that one of those commissioners who resigned because his political party or his religious party had not a majority on the board, that he was more likely to conceal that as his motive or to avow it?—I do not know; he might conceal it. I believe there was not a majority of more than two or three Catholics; there were a great many Protestants, and every one, except two or three, refused to act.

8507. So that you had the concurrence of all the Protestants on the board, except two or three, refusing to act?—They all refused to act.

8508. Mr. Hamilton.] How many Protestants are there on the board now?—I do not know that there is any one at all; I am not sure.

8509. Mr. Hogg.] How many does the board consist of?—Twenty-one.

8510. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Are they all Roman-catholics?—If you will allow the clerk to read the names, I will tell you.

8511. Mr. Hogg.] Did you know the former commissioners were mixed of Protestants and Roman-catholics; were you personally acquainted with them all?—No, I am not personally; I know every man of them; I was acquainted with some of them.

8512. You say you were acquainted with them so far as to speak to them?—Yes.

8513. You never knew any of them assign as a reason for refusing to act, that his associates were Roman-catholics?—No, I did not.

8514. And you have stated you do not believe, from the state of party in Clonmel, that they have any object or desire to conceal party feeling?—No, not the two parties.

8515. They express readily enough their feelings, both sides?—They do.

8516. Either political or religious?—I do not know for religious; I do not think there is a religious feeling in Clonmel.

8517. Mr. O'Connell.] You do not think that the feeling is a good deal a religious one?—I do not think there is a feeling in Clonmel between the two parties about religion.

By *Dennis Walsh*.

4 May 1837.

8518. Mr. *Hogg*.] You do not think the Roman-catholics would object to associate with the Protestants, or that the Protestants would object to associate with the Roman-catholics?—I am quite sure they would.

8519. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] So that after all it is politics!

8520. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Are there many Protestants belonging to the liberal party?—There are two.

8521. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson*.] Then can you account for your former answer, where you say, the Protestant commissioners declined to act, because the majority were Roman-catholics?—Yes; the reason of that is, at least as I heard say, that as they could not carry everything they chose in their own way, they would not act with Roman-catholics.

8522. But if religion makes no difference in Clonmel, between Protestants and Roman-catholics, will you say why the Protestants should have an objection to act with Roman-catholics, merely because they were Roman-catholics?—It is about their politics.

8523. Then it is because of the line of demarcation as to religion, and likewise the line of demarcation as to politics?—I do not think the people of Clonmel have any difference at all about religion on either side, that is my belief.

8524. Are the Roman-catholics in Clonmel, generally speaking, what you call liberals?—I think they are.

8525. Or radicals?—Some are radicals.

8526. And the Protestants, on the other hand, for the most part are what you would call conservatives?—The Protestants and Quakers are what we call conservatives.

8527. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Are some of them Orangemen?—Yes, several are, it is so said for them; I do not know it myself.

8528. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson*.] You are not an Orangeman?—No, I am not.

8529. You do not know them, they are Orangemen?—I say, it is said.

8530. Is it said that there are no Orangemen at all in Tipperary?—I do not know whether there are any.

8531. Do you know what are commonly called Ribbonmen?—I do not know of my own knowledge.

8532. But have you heard of such a thing?—I did not; I did not hear any such thing in Tipperary.

8533. Of course, not in Clonmel?—There is no such thing in Clonmel.

8534. Mr. *O'Connell*.] And I do not believe there is any Ribbon society in the county of Tipperary at present?—I did not hear that there was.

8535. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Perhaps the clerk now will read out the names.

8536. Mr. *Keidy*.] The names are "John Lacy, chairman."

8537. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Is he a Catholic?—He is a Catholic.

(The list was handed to Mr. *O'Connell*.)

8538. John Hackett?—He is a Catholic.

8539. John Dunphy?—He is a Catholic.

8540. John Butler?—He is a Catholic.

8541. Charles Bianconi?—He is a Catholic.

8542. Patrick Quinn?—He is a Catholic.

8543. Thomas O'Brien?—He is a Catholic.

8544. Patrick Corcoran?—He is a Catholic.

8545. Dr. Edward Phelan?—He is a Catholic.

8546. William Kelly?—He is a Catholic.

8547. Eccles Greene?—He is a Catholic.

8548. William P. Lyons?—He is a Catholic.

8549. Patrick O'Neil?—He is a Catholic.

8550. Richard Hayes?—He is a Catholic.

8551. William Sheehy?—He is a Catholic.

8552. William Creane?—He is a Catholic.

8552.* James Forrestal?—He is a Catholic.

8553. Lawrence Davis?—He is a Catholic.

8554. Richard Shanahan.—He is a Catholic.

8555. Patrick Wall?—He is a Catholic.

8556. Thomas Stokes?—He is a Catholic.

8557. William H. Riall, mayor?—He is a Protestant.

8558. Mr. *Serjeant Jackson*.] But the mayor is a commissioner *ex officio*?—Yes.

8559. Mr.

8559. Mr. O'Connell.] Then they are all Catholics except the mayor, who is a commissioner *ex officio*?—Yes. Mr. Dennis Walsh

8560. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] At the second election, how many Protestants were elected?—I think either eight or nine were proposed, and they would not act, with the exception of two or three. 4 May 1837.

8561-2. Mr. Hamilton.] Then what has become of those two or three?—They have resigned since.

8563. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] So that eight or nine were proposed?—Yes, I understood so.

8564. Mr. Hogg.] How many Protestants were actually elected?—There was Mr. Laharte, Mr. Pell and Mr. White, the Quaker. I do not exactly think of any more.

8565. You can only recollect three Protestants actually elected?—No, but the others were in court; they were proposed but they refused to act. Mr. Burke refused to act at different times; he was proposed. Now I recollect, I heard it said that Mr. Burke was one of the commissioners, but he would not act, he refused.

8566. Mr. O'Connell.] He was actually elected?—Yes, as well as I recollect, he was. There were either eight or nine Quakers and Protestants. Mr. Malcomson, I believe, was the first or second man that was proposed.

8567. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And he refused to act?—Yes, so I heard.

8568. Is it your impression, that the reason why no Protestants but one appear on the present list of commissioners is, that they refused to act?—Yes. In fact when the election of 1832 came on, the two parties separated entirely from each other, and they would not act together.

8569. Then it is for that reason, and not upon any religious ground?—Not upon any religious ground.

8570. It happens, however, that the Catholics of Clonmel are on the liberal side in politics, almost to a man, with very few exceptions, and the Protestants and Quakers are on the opposite side, the conservative side, with very few exceptions?—All to a man, with the exception of the two I told you.

8571. Mr. Hogg.] Is the greater portion of the property in Clonmel in the hands of Protestants or Roman-catholics?—I do not know; probably if you included the Quakers with the Protestants, I would say so.

8572. I of course include the Quakers with the Protestants?—

8573. Mr. O'Connell.] But they do not there.

8574. But including the Quakers with the Protestants?—I certainly think, though there are a great many very wealthy Catholics in Clonmel, I think still that the Quakers and Protestants—

8575. In point of property predominate?—Yes.

8576. Now, in point of population, do you know the whole population, and can you state the proportion of the Roman-catholic and of the Protestant population?—I do not know the population, but I heard, I think, on the last census that was taken, it was about 16,000.

8577. Mr. O'Connell.] How many of these were Protestants?—I do not exactly know. I should suppose about one to ten.

8578. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you happen to know what proportion of the rates Mr. Malcomson alone pays?—No, I do not know.

8579. Should you be surprised if you were told he pays one-third of the entire of the rates of the town?—No, I would not; for he has a great many stores and factories.*

8580. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] In the town?—Yes; in the town, within the borough. I would not be surprised at that. Mr. Malcomson has a great many stores.

8581. Mr. O'Connell.] Does he pay rates for his country seat?—I do not know.

8582. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Is that within the limits of the borough?—No, it is not.

8583. Are you quite sure it is not within the limits of the borough?—I do not know; I cannot speak to that.

8584. Chairman.]

* *Mercurii, 10 die Maii, 1837.*

Do you wish to give any explanation of an answer which you gave on a former day with reference to the proportion of the rates of the town which Mr. Malcomson pays; have you since made inquiry, or endeavoured to ascertain what portion of the rate Mr. Malcomson pays?—I have; I find that he pays 27l. 19s. 6½d., and the whole amount of the rates is 344l. 19s. 6½d.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

May 1837.

8584. *Chairman.*] Which set of commissioners, namely, those elected in the year 1828, those elected in the year 1831, or those elected in the year 1834, were possessed of most property?—If I heard the names of the persons I could tell.

8585. Do you believe that the present commissioners represent as much property in their own persons as the first set of commissioners?—I do not believe they do.

8586. Do you believe the second represent as much as the first set of commissioners?—No; I think they were Quakers. There were a great many Quakers, and they had the most money.

8587. Then your answer is, that the first set of commissioners were the parties who represented the greatest amount of property in Clonmel?—I think, as well as I can guess, they did, for they were mostly Quakers.

8588. And therefore they must have paid the greatest amount of rates?—Mr. Malcomson pays more rates than I suppose a dozen men in the town.

8589. Does Mr. Malcomson pay as much rates as all the commissioners now acting pay together?—I should think he does.

8590. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Can you state how many of the present commissioners are retailers of malt and spirituous liquors?—I can name every one of them.

8591. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] Tell us how many of those are retailers in malt and spirituous liquors?—There is Patrick Corcoran, he sells by wholesale and retail; he has joined with me as a wholesale and retail spirit dealer in Main-street.

8592. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Patrick Corcoran, of 32, Main-street, is one of the commissioners?—Yes.

8593. Do you know his house in Main-street?—I do.

8594. What value should you set on that house?—I should suppose he has that house for about 26*l.* or 28*l.* late currency. I should think he would get 40 guineas now for it.

8595. You, I believe, have an establishment of that kind yourself?—Yes.

8596. What is the form in which you obtain your licenses for retail houses?—I joined with this young man in the store on the occasion.

8597. There is some kind of declaration, I believe, respecting the value of the houses, is there not?—No, there is not.

8598. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] When you speak of retail licenses, is it not the practice in all the country towns for grocers to sell spirits by retail?—They all sell it at the counter.

8599. That is the practice?—Yes.

8600. *Mr. Hogg.*] By the dram; by the glass?—Yes.

8601. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] And that is the practice?—Yes, it is.

8602. It is the universal practice, is it?—With every grocer that I know in Clonmel.

8603. Every wholesale grocer has a store, I believe, in which he sells in that way?—Yes.

8604. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Your license duty is regulated by the value of your house?—I believe it is; I do not know; I have not been very long in the grocery business, that I do not exactly know.

8605. Then you cannot state whether an applicant for a license is obliged to state the value of his house?—He is not; at least I know I did not when I applied for my license. I was told my house was valued at so much, and I had to pay so much money.

8606. *Chairman.*] Do you know what license duty Patrick Corcoran pays?—He and I pay for the store on the Quay; I should think something between 12*l.* and 14*l.*

8607. For the license?—Yes.

8608. How much does he pay?—Half that; he and I are in partnership.

8609. *Mr. Hamilton.*] But for his house in Main-street?—I do not know what his license is.

8610. *Chairman.*] You do not know that he is one of those persons that is stated to us to pay for an excise license for the sale of spirits in premises under the annual value of 10*l.*; you do not know that that is the fact?—I do not.

8611. *Mr. O'Connell.*] What value have you set on his house?—Indeed, I do not know; it is worth 40*l.*; his house in the Main-street.

8612. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] Give us the name of the next of these commissioners who is a dealer in spirits?—Mr. Lyons did sell by wholesale and retail; William Paul Lyons.

8613. *Chairman.*] Does he now?—I believe he does.

8614. *Mr*

8614. Mr. Serjeant *Jackson*.] Now give us the name of the next?—Patrick O'Neil.
8615. Does he deal in spirits?—Yes, he does.
8616. Mr. O'Connell.] Wholesale and retail?—No, retail only.
8617. *Chairman*.] What is the value of William Patrick Lyons' house in Irish-town?—I do not know; I should suppose he would get 40 guineas for it; he has laid out a great deal of money in that concern.
8618. You do not know upon what value he pays for his excise license?—I do not.
8619. You are not aware he is returned to us as paying under 10 *l.*?—I know he has it not for 10 *l.*
8620. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Have you any doubt his premises are worth what you state?—They are.
8621. So that if any such return as that has been made, it must be fictitious?—Of course it must.
8622. Mr. *Hogg*.] By "fictitious" you mean "untrue"?—Of course; Mr. Lyons would get 50 guineas a year for his house at this moment, or, I dare say, 55.
8623. Then if he represented to the Excise that his house was rated under 10 *l.* that was untrue?—He would not represent any such thing, he is too respectable a man to do it.
8624. Now mention the next of the commissioners who is a dealer in spirits?—I mentioned Patrick O'Neil.
8625. Is he a wholesale or retail dealer?—Retail.
8626. Now the next?—John Dumphy, wholesale and retail.
8627. Where does he live?—He lives in the Main-street.
8628. Well, is there any other?—No, that is all that I see.
8629. Read each of the others?—John Lacy.
8630. What is he?—A woollen-merchant.
8631. When you say a woollen-merchant, do you mean that he is wholesale or retail?—He is retail.
- 8632-3. Now the next?—John Hackett, proprietor of the Tipperary Press.
8634. Mr. *Hogg*.] Is he a bookseller?—He is.
- 8634*. John Dumphy?—I mentioned him.
8635. Now the next?—John Butler, a cloth merchant.
8635. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Is he a man of much property, Mr. Butler?—Yes, he is a man of property. Charles Bianconi, he is a proprietor of oaks; he is worth some thousands of pounds.
8637. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Do you know how many hundred horses he has in his establishment?—As well as I recollect, he has 1,000 horses; Patrick Quinn, tobacconist and chandler; Thomas O'Brien, woollen-merchant; Edward Phelan, medical doctor; William Kelly, tanner, tobacconist and chandler; Eccles Greene, baker; Richard Hayes, a corn-merchant; William Sheehy, saddler; William Creane, tanner and leather-merchant; James Forrestal, a man of property; Lawrence Davis, tanner; Richard Shanahan, broker; Patrick Wall, tobacconist; there is another name I forgot to mention, Thomas Stokes, who has a wholesale and retail license; I think he has a wholesale license.
8638. Mr. *Hamilton*.] You stated that the division arose from the election in 1833?—Indeed it did, that was the first time.
8639. Do you remember when the commissioners went out, in 1831?—Yes.
8640. Was there any excitement connected with the election of the commissioners upon that occasion?—It was at first 12 or 18 months before we had an election in Clonmel; speaking generally, about the Reform Bill.
8641. But I am speaking of the election of the commissioners under the 9th of George the 4th.—The people, when they understood that they had the right to appoint commissioners, felt a sort of jealousy, and said they should have a share in the management of the affairs of the town as well as the other people.
8642. Were placards of an inflammatory character posted upon that occasion?—No, not one.
8643. Was there no imputation of monopoly and jobbing of the former commissioners?—No, I never heard of any, nor did I ever hear of it until this moment.
8644. Mr. *Hogg*.] Was that the commencement of political and religious party spirit in Clonmel?—Not religious. That was the first time they began.
8645. Was

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

4 May 1837.

8645. Was that the commencement of violent party spirit in Clonmel?—It was.

8646. Were you peaceable and quiet before that?—I think, very peaceable.

8647. Was there an absence of party spirit before that?—No, indeed there was not an absence, because, if I do not mistake, there was a petition from the corporation of Clonmel against Catholic emancipation; I am not quite sure, but I think there was a petition.

8648. *Chairman.*] What I want to know is with regard to the election of the commissioners in 1834; was not your attention called to the value or the under value of various houses in the year 1833?—I believe it was, and then they thought they could not save so much as the sum that they would be obliged to pay for a new valuation. I have heard some say that was the reason they did not get the town re-valued.

8649. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Do you mean to say they would have re-valued the town?—Yes, they would, but the expense was too great; I heard some of the commissioners say so. The expense of valuing was so great that they thought they could not gain so much by a re-valuation as they would expend in doing it; so I heard some of the commissioners say.

8650. *Chairman.*] And that reason, you say, is not likely to actuate them in July next?—No; I think they are determined to get it re-valued.

8651. You stated the other day, you believed there were about 30 persons who were rated as holding tenements of the value of 10 *l.*, in the year 1833, but which tenements were not of the value of 10 *l.*?—I believe, if my evidence were looked over, I said about 20.

8652. Well, but about 20 you now say; now, of those 20, how many were rated at 10 *l.* in the commissioners' books?—I do not know that one of them is rated; they may be, but I do not know.

8653. But, in spite of that, when the commissioners came in, in the following year, they did not think it judicious to re-value the town?—That was the reason that I heard several of them say it was the expense; they did not like it; they thought they could not save so much as the expense would be.

8654. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Now, what does that purport to be [*handing a book to the Witness*]?—A Report of the Commissioners of Public Instruction in Ireland.

8655. For what year?—The year 1834.

8656. Now, will you state, from that return, what appears to have been the entire population of Clonmel at that time, the entire number?—17,835.

8657. *Chairman.*] How many are stated to be Roman-catholics?—15,848.

8658. Well, read it?—Presbyterians, 44; other Protestant Dissenters, 200; members of the Protestant Established Church, 1,737.

8659. Well, Quakers?—The Quakers appear to be included among the 300.

8660. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Now, you have been asked whether, in point of property, the commissioners who were first appointed in 1828, were not considerably more wealthy than the commissioners subsequently appointed in 1831, or the present commissioners, appointed in 1834; and you stated they were?—Yes, I think they were more wealthy.

8661. Now, the present commissioners, I think you told me on a former occasion, were very respectable men?—They are very, and very wealthy, some of them.

8662. Do you happen to know how they stand in point of intelligence?—They are very respectable intelligent men.

8663. Are there not amongst them some men of the very first intelligence?—I think so; I think as respectable as any men in Clonmel.

8664. *Chairman.*] You had better ask him if they are not very clever men.—

8665. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Do you consider them clever men, some of them?—I do.

8666. Respectable clever men?—I do not think there are more clever men in Clonmel than several of the commissioners.

8667. So that for competency and skill in the business which the commissioners are called upon to do, do you consider they are inferior to the first class of commissioners?—I do not; I think they discharge their duty and give satisfaction.

8668. But I mean for competency to discharge their duties; do you consider them inferior to the first class of commissioners?—I do not.

8669. Do

8669. Do you not consider them rather superior, taken as a body?—I think at least you will hear it said, there are some very knowing and intelligent men among the present commissioners. There are some very clever men. There is one man that is certainly considered one of the cleverest men in Clonmel.

8670. Who is he?—Dr. Phelan.

8671. And what do you say to Mr. Bianconi?—He is a very clever man, and a very respectable man. Mr. Stokes, Mr. Hackett and Mr. Butler are all very clever intelligent men.

8672. They are men of business?—They are; yes.

8673. And attentive to the discharge of their duties?—They attend very closely to it, very closely.

8674. Then I believe the result is this; that whatever may be the case, as to a comparison of property, (I am now merely considering the present commissioners with reference to the first set,) the inhabitants of the town have not suffered at least by the change, so far as competency to discharge the duties of the office go?—No; on the contrary the people there are more pleased with them, for they can go and make their complaints to them, and they will take greater trouble than the former commissioners did.

8675. Then, in point of fact, they attend more sedulously to the discharge of their duties than the first?—Yes.

8676. They are more accessible to the complaints of the inhabitants?—They are now. I know the present commissioners, even if any of the watchmen, or anything else is done, anything out the way, any of the inhabitants could go to them and report them; whereas the others, they would not like to make so free with them as they do with these.

8677. The others were not in the habit then of communicating so freely with the inhabitants at large?—No, they were not.

8678. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Did you ever know an instance of any of the former commissioners declining to hear a complaint?—I never did.

8679. Did you ever hear that any one of the former commissioners neglected his duty as such?—I did not hear of any of them neglecting their duty; but I say that the people would not make so free with them, that they would not go to make complaints to them so readily as they go to the present commissioners. I do not mean to cast the slightest imputation upon them; they were all highly respectable men.

8680. Are all the commissioners, except the present mayor, (I do not know what his politics may be), but are all the other commissioners of the same political class?—They are.

8681. They are all what you call liberals or radicals; are they not?—Every man, with the exception of one or two, voted for Mr. Rosayne.

8682. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Who are the one or two?—Dr. Phelan and Mr. Wall.

8683. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Are they all what you would call liberals or radicals?—They are liberals.

8684. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Is not that because the Protestants and Quakers refused to act?—So I heard it. Two of the commissioners who are here I heard say that Mr. Malcolmson and several other Protestants refused to act.

8685. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you call Mr. Wall a liberal, who voted for Mr. Bagwell?—We brought him round the last time, we made him vote the last time for Mr. Rosayne.

8686. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then if the Protestants, that is to say, the conservatives in Clonmel, refused to act as commissioners, the inhabitants must have gone without commissioners, if they had not elected persons of opposite politics?—They must.

8687. So that it was the necessity of the case, and not the choice of the inhabitants, that occasioned all the present commissioners, except one or two, being on the same side in politics?—The inhabitants were very anxious there should be a mixture of both. I knew the feelings of a great many persons in Clonmel, and they were anxious they should be nearly half and half, but they would rather have the majority themselves.

8688. Mr. Hogg.] Do you believe, that if one half of the conservatives had offered themselves as candidates, from your local knowledge they would have been elected?—I have no doubt in my mind they would; the inhabitants would

Mr. Dennis Falster

4 May 1857.

wish to keep one majority no doubt, they would like one, they would take care to have one majority.

8689. *Chairman.*] They would take care to have 11 out of 21?—Yes; and the reason is, that they thought that the former set of commissioners treated them badly. The shop-keepers were hurt that they did not put six or eight or ten of their own in.

8690. *Mr. Hogg.*] They would have been anxious to have had what you call a number of conservative candidates on the other side, taking care to have had the majority?—They would have had the majority.

8691. And would have been determined to have it?—Yes.

8692. And would have acted together?—They would; they were very anxious to have a mixture.

8693. So that the number of conservatives that would have been admitted, would have been totally devoid of either use or influence?—I do not know that. I know this much, that the very first set of the commissioners was to appoint a Protestant.

8694. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] To what office?—To the office of chairman; that was the first act of the commissioners.

8695. These were the commissioners of 1831?—Yes; the commissioners of 1831.

8696. Their first act was to appoint a Protestant chairman?—Yes; and afterwards, I believe, they wished to appoint Mr. White, the Quaker, and he would not act as chairman.

8697. *Mr. O'Connell.*] If the conservatives had a majority, they would go together?—There is not a doubt of that.

8698. They stick together better than the liberals, do not they?—They do indeed.

8699. So that if there was a minority of the liberals, and the conservatives had a majority, the liberals would have no efficient vote?—They would not.

8700. Would the conservatives have elected a Catholic chairman, do you think?—They never did it, they never appointed one before.

8701. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Then, in point of fact, it would have been a trial of strength between the two parties in any way?—I do not know; I know the Catholics were very anxious to have a mixture, and the first act they did was to appoint a Protestant chairman; they were determined to have a majority.

8702. *Mr. Hogg.*] The struggle between the two parties was as regards the numbers, and not as regards the property?—No, the numbers: no man is allowed to vote but a rate-payer.

8703. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] Of what political party are you a member, a liberal or conservative?—I am a liberal.

8704. Do you take part in election politics?—I do not think there is a man in Clonmel who takes a more active part than I do.

8705. Do the commissioners whose names we have had, the present commissioners, take any part in election politics?—They do.

8706. Are they very active men in election politics?—Some of them are, and some of them are lazy enough.

8707. Did you prepare any notices of registry?—No, I never filled up notices, but I have given persons the names of persons who have had notices filled up.

8708. Have you served notices?—I have.

8709. Have you served many notices?—I have, a great many indeed.

8710. Did you give in the names of any persons whom you know to be occupiers of houses under 10*l.* value?—I do not know that I did.

8711. Are you sure?—I am quite sure I never served a notice; there were a great many notices served in the commencement, but I did not serve one. I have never served a notice for a man that I thought was not entitled to register.

8712. Do you mean to say you never served one?—I served one, but I never filled up a notice myself.

8713. But you caused a large number of notices to be given?—I did.

8714. There was a very large number of notices given by others also?—There were a great many.

8715. You seem to have been somewhat circumspect in your notices; you did not put forward any person whose premises you knew were under 10*l.* value?—I caused several notices to be served for persons that were rejected for many

reasons; I have often served notices on persons who have been rejected one session and admitted the next.

8716. But I say, you seem to have been careful not to have put forward the claims of persons you did not consider to possess the qualification of 10*l.*?—I was always, and those persons who acted with me, were always very particular in not having notices served for any man except we thought he would register.

8717. Do you know, nevertheless, that other persons did cause a large number of notices to be served?—I know they did.

8718. In your interest?—Yes, both sides.

8719. For persons whom they knew occupied premises that were under the value of 10*l.*?—I have often seen notices filled.

8720. But nevertheless, they would fill them and serve them in spite of you?—They did.

8721. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And that was done on both sides of politics?—Yes, from the notices I have seen, and the papers I have seen, I know persons to have served notices on the other side who were not entitled to vote.

8722. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Have you any persons denominated pacificators in your happy town?—I believe we have.

8723. Who are your pacificators?—I think Mr. John Butler is one.

8724. And when did you get that class of useful public functionaries in your town?—I suppose about three months ago. I am not certain he was one, I heard he was.

8725. How came you to appoint these pacificators?—I do not know.

8726. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did you appoint them?—No.

8727. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Who appointed them?—I do not know that. I do not know who the gentlemen were, that were appointed at all. I believe Mr. John Butler, the cloth merchant, was one.

8728. Was that the person to whom you served your time?—No.

8729. Have you done business with him?—I have done business with him as a cloth merchant, but not for the last four or five years.

8730. What is the business of the pacificator?—I assure you, I do not know; I heard what his business was.

8731. What did you hear it was?—One of the objects, I believe, was to attend to the registry, and the next was, if there were any secret societies or anything, to report to the General Association in Dublin.

8732. And does this Mr. Butler attend to the registries?—No, he does not.

8733. So that he does not perform the principal duty of a pacificator?—I do not know whether that is one of the duties, but I should suppose it was.

8734. Mr. Hogg.] Is he a Clonmel man?—He is.

8735. Mr. O'Connell.] The duties of pacificators were printed in the newspapers, were they not?—Yes, they were.

8736. And circulated in printed hand-bills?—Yes, I saw placards; I did not read them attentively, but the principal thing, I believe, was to attend to the registries, and to see there should be no secret societies in the district.

8737. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you see anything objectionable in either of these classes of duties?—I do not.

8738. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Had you any such things as churchwardens formerly in the town of Clonmel?—We have them at present.

8739. I mean Roman-catholic churchwardens?—I do not know that they went by that name.

8740. Churchwardens appointed by the Association?—I believe there were.

8741. Did they do the same duties as these pacificators now do?—What duties are they?

8742. Attending to the registry?—No, they did not. I do not think they attended to the registry.

8743. What did they do; what were their functions?—I believe one of their objects was —

8744. You say that these pacificators were appointed three months ago?—I should suppose about that.

8745. Was it by the Association they were appointed?—Of course it was by the Association. They may have been, I dare say, recommended by popular men, or they would not have been appointed by the Association.

8746. Have you any notion as to what number of persons you caused notices to be served of registry?—No, I could not tell.

Mr. Dennis Wolfe.
4 May 1837.

8747. Were you the person who came to London in the year 1833, when Mr. Bagwell petitioned?—I was.

8748. Did you give evidence on that occasion?—No.

8749. What did you come over for?—To give evidence.

8750. Upon what subject?—With regard to persons who voted for Mr. Bagwell.

8751. As to undervalue?—Yes.

8752. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] One question more as to these commissioners; you stated, from the Parliamentary Returns, that the proportion of Protestants in Clonmel to the Catholics, the Protestants of the Established Church and Dissenters together, was, I think, 1,500 to 15,000?—1,000 to 15,000 some hundreds.

8753. Now that being the proportion of Protestants to Catholics, does it occur to you that it was unreasonable in the inhabitants in the year 1831, when they came to elect new commissioners, to put seven or eight (I think you said they proposed seven or eight) Protestants, and the remaining number Catholics, do you consider that an undue proportion?—I do not.

8754. The entire amount of Protestant inhabitants being 1,000, and the Catholics 15,000, do you consider that an undue proportion?—I do not.

8755. Now, do you consider it unreasonable, the population being what you have stated, that the Catholic inhabitants should expect to have at least a majority of one?—I think they ought to have; and I know, if I had had a voice at the time, I would have just given them the same number as they gave the Catholics the first time, that was four.

8756. And would you consider that was giving them as much as they were entitled to?—Yes.

8757. But the Catholic inhabitants at large were willing to give more?—They were; they wanted merely just to have the majority.

8758. Now, inasmuch as there would be a majority on one side or the other, either of Protestants or of Catholics, does it occur to you unreasonable that the Catholics, being some 15,000, should think they ought to have the majority, rather than the Protestants, who were only 1,000?—I think they ought to have the majority.

8759. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Did you ever hear a complaint made by the Protestant inhabitants of those Catholic commissioners acting unfairly towards them?—Never; I never did. There are some very respectable and wealthy men commissioners.

8760. Mr. *Hogg*.] Supposing there were no religious and political parties at Clonmel, should you consider it right that the commissioners should be selected from those possessing the greatest portion of property, and contributing most largely to the rates?—I do not think they ought; I do not think they are the persons who ought to be selected. I would look to the intelligence of persons, and to the persons I thought would give more satisfaction and pay more attention.

8761. And you do not think, that in a body of persons assessing rates and taxes, it is fit and proper to give the greatest influence to those who contribute most largely?—I really think were Clonmel situated—

8762. No, my question is in the abstract; do you or not, think it right that those who contribute most largely to rates and taxes should have the greatest voice in imposing those rates and taxes to which they contribute?—I do not think they ought.

8763. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Do you consider numbers ought to be taken into account, habits of business in candidates for the office, and competency to discharge their duties; that all those matters should be taken into account as well as the mere possession of property?—I do.

8764. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Are not very wealthy people likely to neglect taking an active share in business that does not immediately require it?—They are; but some of the present commissioners, I think, are as wealthy as any of the former commissioners. There is one man, I believe, worth from 20,000 l to 30,000 l.

8765. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Who is he?—Mr. Keily.

8766. So that, in other words, the mere possession of property does not in your mind constitute the only proper qualification for a commissioner of rates under the 9th of Geo. 4?—It does not.

8767. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Do not you think the poor man finds his pound more to him than the rich man does his 20 l.?—Yes.

8768. Mr.

8768. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And do not you think he is likely to look more sharply after his pound than the rich man is after his 20 l.?—Yes.

8769. Mr. Hogg.] You do not mean to imply, that the possession of property excludes capacity or intelligence?—I do not.

8770. On the contrary, I suppose you mean to say, that those possessing property, generally speaking, having more leisure, are more likely to have intelligence and capacity than those in a bungler sphere?—I do not know; I think there are men in that rank of life among the present commissioners who have had the same opportunities as the former commissioners, taking them as a body.

8771. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] You think the present commissioners are a well educated men as the first set?—I certainly think they are.

8772. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And at all events, as competent to discharge their duties as commissioners?—I think they are as well educated men, for there were very few men among the other commissioners who got a classical education at all, they were all men of business; I think the present commissioners are very intelligent men.

8773. I suppose the former commissioners could read and write?—Of course.

8774-5. Do you mean to say their attainments did not go much beyond that?—I think they were mostly merchants, confined to their counting-houses.

8776. Chairman.] Do not the parties holding larger houses, pay more in proportion than the persons holding smaller ones?—They do.

8777. But still you think that those parties, though they pay a greater ratio of taxation, should not be the individuals to have the power of inflicting that taxation?—I do not think they ought.

8778. Can you state at all, who were the persons who have a right to vote for these commissioners?—Persons paying 5 l.

8779. Rated at 5 l.?—Yes.

8780. What are the proportions between these individuals in the town of Clonmel, as to religious opinions; does the proportion of one in eight prevail with regard to them, as it does with regard to the whole population?—I do not understand the question.

8781. How many 5 l. houses and upwards, do you think there are in Clonmel?—I do not know; a great many.

8782. One thousand, or 2,000, or what?—I should suppose 1,000, I cannot say positively, but I should suppose so.

8783. Supposing there are 800 houses in Clonmel above 5 l. value, do you think that 700 of those are occupied by Roman-catholics?—I do not exactly know.

8784. You cannot answer the question what the proportions are?—It is one to 15, I think.

8785. Chairman, to Mr. Keily.] What is the entire number of houses rated?—I think the entire number of houses, including stores and premises of every description rated under the Act of Parliament, amounts to about 1,100.

8786. (To Mr. Walsh.) You have heard it stated that there are 1,100 premises rated under the jurisdiction of the commissioners; now how many of those 1,100 do you conceive are held or occupied by Roman-catholics, and how many by Protestants?—I cannot say.

8787. Do you think there are 800 of them held by Roman-catholics?—I do not know; I could not say.

8788. Do you think there are 600 held by Roman-catholics?—I think there must be 600.

8789. Do you think there are 800?—I could not say.

8790. Do you think the proportion is the same, namely, eight to one, in cases of Roman-catholics holding houses of that value, to what the whole population of the town is stated to be?—I could not answer the question.

8791. Mr. Keily.] I should observe there are several of those premises the property of one individual perhaps.

8792. Mr. Hogg, to Mr. Walsh.] You have stated you are a strong party man, and you have given your opinion in evidence under party feeling necessarily?—I should be very sorry to do it.

8793. I mean your opinions, not facts?—I have given my opinion.

8794. Now if one party were going out of power, and another coming in whom

Mr. Dennis Walsh
and
Mr. Keily.

4 May 1837.

Mr. Dennis Walsh
and
Mr. Kelly.
4 May 1837.

you considered a party in your favour, would you be influenced at all by feelings of retaliation as well as by feelings of general fitness, in the election of the persons coming into power?—I would favour that party I thought most fit, certainly; I would like to see that the persons acting with myself would have the majority on the commission.

8795. My question was; would you not be actuated exclusively by feelings of fitness in the election of public persons, or influenced by your political desire to retaliate on an adversary?—I should be very sorry to retaliate; unless I saw they were sufficient men, and as capable of discharging the duties as the other commissioners, I would not allow my feelings to carry me so far as to appoint unfit persons.

8796. You stated that if you had had the election of the commissioners, you would not have allowed more than four Protestants or conservatives to be among the number, fit or unfit, because when they had the predominance they only allowed four Catholics; did you not state that?—I did state that; and I knew very well when I did state that, I could get as intelligent and as respectable men of the party I belong to, or of the Roman-catholics, as any other person in Clonmel; and that I would appoint the persons who were generally acting with Catholics in preference to the others.

8797. In stating that opinion, am I right in saying you are influenced by feelings of retaliation towards the opposite party?—Yes, but unless I found the persons so generally acting with Catholics, discharged the duties as well as the others, I should not interfere.

8798. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But you stated the great majority of the inhabitants had a different impression and feeling from you upon that subject, and actually appointed twice as many?—Yes, I was displeased with them for thinking of appointing more than the four.

8799. Mr. Hogg.] Then your political feelings, whatever they are, are much stronger than those of the majority?—With regard to the commissioners, because I thought they treated—

8800. Upon that subject your political feelings are much stronger than those of the majority?—Yes; for I thought they treated the respectable Roman-catholics in Clonmel unfairly; they passed them over, and would not appoint them; old inhabitants that were living there 30 and 40 years.

8801. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now let me ask you if we have not entirely lost sight of the business of the day. Do you know the premises of John Bagg, in Upper Johnson-street?—I do.

8802. Now will you describe those premises?—He has a large house, a slaughter-house, and two yards. He has a constant lodger in the house, that pays him 2s. a week for each of the rooms that he set him.

8803. Does he let the slaughter-house?—He does.

8804. He is a butcher?—He is a butcher.

8805. Does he keep pigs?—He does; he has two large yards.

8806. Now you examined his premises?—I did.

8807. With a view to ascertain their value?—Yes, both now and in the year 1833.

8808. What is the result of your inquiry and examination as to the value of those premises?—That it is worth 10*l*.

8809. Have you any hesitation now in putting that value upon those premises?—I have not, not the least.

8810. Do you conceive that 10*l*. can be got for those premises if they were now to be let?—I am quite sure that 10*l*. would be had to-morrow, according to the way houses are set there.

8811. Accordingly, when Mr. Joseph Higgins says (number 2932.), "Do you know John Bagg, in the same street?—I do. What is the value of his house?—Seven pounds, I should say. Is he registered?—Yes. Do you mean that there also 7*l*. is the rent?—I do not know what the rent of his place is, but I think that is about the value of his place." Now, when he states 7*l*. as the value, then you do not agree in opinion with him?—I do not.

8812. Now, do you know the premises of Daniel English?—I do.

8813. Will you describe them?—

8814. Chairman.] Are they in the same same street?—In Upper Johnson-street? yes.

8815. He is a carpenter?—He is a carpenter.

8816. (To Mr. Kelly.) What is he valued at in the book?—Five pounds.

8817. Mr. Serjeant Ball, to Mr. Walsh. Do you happen to know what his rent is?—He has it for little or nothing; his father had a long lease, or his grandfather, I do not know which.

8818. Is the lease now more than 30 years old?—I do not know; I know he was ejected the last session.

8819. Was that for non-payment of rent?—No, on the title; he defeated them.

8820. Then he has a title now subsisting?—He has.

8821. And it is under some old instrument?—It is. That is all I know about it. I saw it produced in court.

8822. Now, what do you state to be the value of that house?—The house is divided; he has half of it set, which pays him 5*l.*, and he holds the other half himself.

8823. Have you any doubt the whole of that house is well worth 10*l.* a year?—I have not, the whole house; half of it is divided; half of it is set at 5*l.* a year.

8824. Mr. Hamilton.] Does the division make them separate houses?—It does.

8825. Mr. O'Connell.] That valuation includes both of those that are now separate tenements?—It does.

8826. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then that is another instance, in your judgment, of the inaccuracy of that valuation?—It is.

8827. Do you know the house of Thomas Boyd, in Duckett-street?—I do.

8828. He is a shoemaker?—He is.

8829. Can you describe that house?—I can.

8830. Do so?—There is a kitchen, a room and a workshop on the first floor; there is a yard and pig-house, and two rooms up stairs.

8831. Now, do you happen to know what rent he paid for that formerly?—Eight pounds, late currency, was the rent that was paid for that.

8832. Is that the rent paid at present?—Yes.

8833. Do you happen to know he paid formerly a higher rent?—He paid at one time eight guineas, and he pays only 8*l.* now.

8834. Chairman.] Eight pounds Irish?—Eight pounds Irish.

8835. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Does he let lodgings?—He does.

8836. Do you know what he gets for his lodgings?—They are convenient for the barracks; he sets two rooms up stairs at 3*s.* a week; all the houses in that street are nearly the same sort of houses, and according as the tenants leave, and they get out of possession, they raise the rent; Miss Duckett they belong to.

8837. What value do you put on that house?—It is worth 10*l.* a year.

8838. Have you any doubt of that?—I have not; there are houses in the neighbourhood very little better, set for 10 guineas, and they could get more for them, only they are later built.

8839. So that, if that house were now to be let, you have no doubt 10*l.* could be got for it?—I have no doubt of it.

8840. Chairman, to Mr. Kelly.] What is the valuation of that house?—Six pounds.

8841. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now, attend to this; I am now going to the evidence of Mr. William Smith, (number 3325 :) "Do you know Thomas Boyd of Duckett-street?—Thomas Boyd has a similar house to William Burke's; it is

about 8*l.* a year in value; two rooms; and the rooms are very small rooms, taken off of the kitchen, and two rooms over head, and a small yard. Do you know Boyd's rent?—£. 7. 7*s.* 6*d.* Is he a voter?—He is. He is a shoemaker by trade?

—Yes. Do you happen to know that Boyd lets lodgings?—He does; the greater part of them let lodgings. Is not his house in the neighbourhood of the barracks?—It is not far from the barracks. Does not that make houses of that description rather more valuable?—I think it does. Do you know that he has a yard attached to it?—He has a yard and a pig-house. Do you know also, that about two years ago that he took those premises at 12*l.* a year rent?—No, I am not aware of that. What do you state as to the value of this house; you see it

pays 8*l.* Irish, and he lets lodgings; it is in the neighbourhood of barracks, and he has this yard and piggery in the rear; what value would you put upon it?

—I would not say, if it were to be let to-morrow, that more than 8*l.* 10*s.* would be expected for it." Now to pause there, do you observe that Mr. Smith states

0.39.

3 0 3 in

Mr. Dennis Walsh
and
Mr. Kelly.

4 May 1837.

Mr. Dennis Walsh
and
Mr. Keily.

4 May 1837.

in his evidence that the house is worth at least 8*l.* 10*s.*, and that the valuation in the book there is only 6*l.*; is not that another instance of the inaccuracy of that valuation?—It is.

8842. Upon the admission of Mr. Smith himself?—Yes.

8843. Now when Mr. Smith says that it is worth only 8*l.* 10*s.*, and that no more could be got for it, you do not agree in opinion with him?—I do not. I have not the least doubt in my mind that 10*l.* could be got to-morrow for every house in Duckett-street; there was a man registered in the house nearly opposite to that.

8844. Who was he?—A man named Manning, and Mr. Howley obliged him to give evidence; and it was proved to him that 10*l.* could be got for the house, and he registered him.

8845. Mr. Hamilton.] Who is Boyd's landlord?—I do not know whether it is Mr. or Miss Duckett; I believe I can tell you; Miss Charlotte Duckett it was.

8846. And was the house that Manning was registered out of, before Mr. Howley on evidence adduced for the purpose of sustaining his right to register, was that better?—They are of the same description; there was a slaughter-house built on that.

8847. Is Patrick Hickey's, of Duckett-street, the same?—Yes.

8848. You give the same evidence as to the value of that house?—Yes.

8849. John Egan, you give the same evidence as to the value of his house?—Yes, the same; they are all houses of the same description.

8850. Now, John Everard, Bagwell-street, do you know him?—Yes.

8851. And his premises?—Yes.

8852. Now, will you describe them?—

8853. Chairman, to Mr. Keily.] What is he entered at in the book?—John Everard? his valuation is 5*l.*

8854. Mr. Sergeant Ball, to Mr. Walsh.] Describe those premises?—A nailer's shop, kitchen inside it, two rooms up stairs, and he has built a hack house himself, where he carried on his business.

8855. Do you know whether that was built since 1828; since the time that that valuation was made?—That has been built, I suppose, these 14 years.

8856. Is the situation good?—Very good.

8857. Is there a forge?—There is a forge. He is a nailer.

8858. Now, do you know, in point of fact, of his having been offered any sum for that?—I do; I have it from his landlord.

8859. Who is his landlord?—Mr. Burke. His landlord would give him, I think, half a year's rent that he owes him, and I believe he would give him 5*l.* if he left the house; there was another man offered him 10*l.* a year and a fine of 5*l.*

8860. For that house?—Yes. He only told me so; I do not know it of my own knowledge.

8861. Do you know whether there was any other offer made to him for any part of the house?—There was; the cooper offered him 1*s.* a week for the use of the workshop.

8862. Then that being so, attend to this evidence of Mr. William Smith's, (number 3348:) "John Everard, nailer, in Bagwell-street?—He has a nailer's forge in a very small slated house. What do you value it at?—Eight pounds. Do you know what the rent is?—I believe about 7*l.*"?—I heard it from the landlord; it was 7*l.* 10*s.*, present currency.

8863. But having heard this evidence of Smith's, namely, that he values the premises at 8*l.*, and the rent being 7*l.*, what do you say to that valuation of 8*l.* in the commissioners' book?—The valuation speaks for itself, I think.

8864. And is it not palpably erroneous?—It is of course.

8865. And that upon the admission of Mr. William Smith even?—It is.

8866. Now then, have I asked you, what do you take to be the value of that house?—I have not the least doubt in the world, in my mind, that to-morrow he would get 10*l.* for it.

8867. Chairman.] You know you have stated, that the landlord of the house, Mr. Burke, told you that a person offered him 10*l.* a year rent and 5*l.* fine?—No, he offered Everard 5*l.*

8868. Who did?—The landlord did, and to give him half a year's rent if he gave up possession, for I believe he is going to build on it, or to set it for building ground.

8869. Then I want to know, did he tell you at the time why he was so anxious to get rid of Everard?—I know that was the reason. That the Bank of Ireland, before

before it could be built, they were in treaty with Burke for those concerns, and he is very anxious to get possession of them.

8870. *Mr. Hamilton.*] So that the landlord's offer is no criterion of the value of the house?—I do not think it was.

8871. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] But in addition to that, did you not state that the tenant Everard was offered 10 *l.* a year and a fine of 5 *l.*?—I did.

8872. *Chairman.*] By whom?—I do not know who the man was.

8873. Who told you that?—Everard.

8874. Why would not Everard take it?—He would not leave the house. I do not think he could match himself so well in Clonmel for 10 *l.* a year; the situation is very good, and it is very hard to get a situation; there are parts of Clonmel, the upper part of Irish-town, and you get a house there for 11 *l.* or 12 *l.* a year, but if you had such a house down in the Main-street, you would have to pay 25 *l.* or 26 *l.* for it, the same size. In Clonmel people pay for situation as much as anything else.

8875. But what I want to know is, what is the holding of this Everard; is it under lease?—I do not know. I know if it were not, if he had not some hold of it, Burke would put him out immediately; for the Bank of Ireland, when Mr. Scott was in treaty, I heard, offered a certain sum of money.

8876. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Now, do you know Patrick Burke's premises, in Dispensary-street?—I do; I believe I mentioned them the other day. They are the same as Curry's and Russell's that I spoke of the last day.

8877. Was that Michael Russell?—Yes; Michael Russell.

8878. Are those the same premises?—The same row.

8879. Then the evidence you gave respecting Michael Russell's premises you consider applicable to Patrick Burke's?—Which Patrick Burke is that? there are two in Dispensary-street. There is one person that lived there that I would not say his house was worth 10 *l.* a year.

8880. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Who is that?—A man named Patrick Burke.

8881. A smith?—Yes.

8882. And what was the other man; a shopman, is that him?—Yes.

8883. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Then your evidence is, that the premises of Patrick Burke, who is designated as a shopman on the registry, and registered in October 1832, that those premises are the same in value and character as the premises of Michael Russell, concerning which you gave evidence on the last day?—Yes, the same, with the exception that Russell has one room that he divided into two.

8884. *Mr. Hamilton.*] I asked about Patrick Burke, of Dispensary-street, a smith; you stated his house was not worth 10 *l.* a year?—I would not take on me to say it was. That is in a different part of the street.

8885. *Chairman.*] Do you know whether he is on the registry?—No, he is not.

8886. But he was?—Yes, he was.

8887. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] How came he to be off?—He is removed.

8888. *Chairman.*] No. 2, Dispensary-street?—Yes.

8889. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Did you know the premises of Martin Callaghan, of New-street?—I did.

8890. I believe he is dead?—He is.

8891. Do you recollect his voting at the last contested election?—He voted on the two occasions for Mr. Bagwell.

8892. Do you remember his being carried to the hustings to vote?—He was brought out of the Lunatic Asylum.

8893. And what became of him afterwards?—He died a few days afterwards.

8894. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Then he had sense enough to vote, though he came out of the Lunatic Asylum?—He came under the care of keepers.

8895. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] The keepers had sense enough to carry him there, is not that it?—They had.

8896. Now, do you know Thomas Welch's premises?—I do, in New-street.

8897. *Mr. Hamilton.*] You do not conceive those to be worth 10 *l.* a year?—I do not.

8898. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] The same thing I might have said of Martin Callaghan, that you did not consider his premises worth 10 *l.* a year?—No.

8899. Now, James Gleeson, do you know him?—I do.

8900. What do you call that; Cashell-road, is it not?—Yes.

8901. Now, will you describe those premises?—Gleeson has a very nice property

Mr. Dennis Walsh
and
Mr. Keely.

4 May 1837.

Mr. Dennis Walsh
and
Mr. Kelly,
4 May 1837.

party there. There are four houses, with the one he lives in, that he built there himself; his is a very excellent house, and a very good garden and back house.

8902. Now, he has built four houses, you say?—He has.

8903. Are any of the tenants registered?—No.

8904. He is the only person registered out of that property?—He is the only person. I recollect when we came over here in the year 1833, we would not have opposed that man, because we knew his place was very well worth 10 *l.* a year.

8905. Then you have no doubt, from what you state, that the premises he actually occupies are worth 10 *l.* a year?—If he walked out of the house to-morrow he would get 10 *l.* for them at once.

8906. Now, that being so, what do you say to this evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins, (No. 2944:) "Do you know the house of James Gleeson, in Cashill-road?—I do. What is the value of that?—*£.* 6 or 7 *l.* a year. That man has a range of cabins; and his own house, if let separately, would not let for more than 6 *l.* or 7 *l.* a year; but he has built a range of cabins, and the ground on which his house stands is the same as that on which these cabins stand, so that it is worth a little more in that way." Now do you agree in opinion with Mr. Joseph Higgins?—Indeed, I do not; they are very neat houses.

8907. But on the main question, namely, what is the value of the house he actually occupies?—If he walked out of the house to-morrow he could get 10 *l.* a year for it.

8908. You are satisfied he could get 10 *l.* a year for it?—I am quite sure of it. I suppose there is not in the town of Clonmel a neater garden.

8909. *Chairman*, to Mr. Kelly.] What are James Gleeson's premises valued at?—They are not taken into the valuation.

8910. Then he is under 5 *l.*?—

8911. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Is Cashill-road beyond the limits?—It is.

8912. He does not appear on the valuation-book?—No.

8913. (To Mr. Walsh.) Then, that being so, when you find that Mr. Joseph Higgins states that the value of one of the houses only is 6 *l.* or 7 *l.* a year, can you have any doubt that the valuation-book is incorrect in that particular also?—Indeed it is.

8914. Is that another instance of the extreme inaccuracy of that valuation?—It is; there are a great many houses in that street not valued at all; houses paying 7 *l.*, 7 *l.* 10 *s.* and 8 *l.* a year, and not one valued; and all within the corporation limits, every one.

8915. Then if that be so, after the evidence you have already given with respect to this book, and the passage in the evidence of the other witnesses to which I have called your attention, do you consider yourself justified in saying that that valuation-book is not a criterion at all of the value of houses?—It is no criterion; I think it is most inaccurate, as far as I have heard.

8915*. Do you know the premises of Thomas Kelly in Gravel-walk?—I do.

8916. Do you consider them worth 10 *l.* a year?—I would not take on me to say they are worth 10 *l.* a year.

8916*. Mr. Hamilton.] It is a thatched cabin?—Yes.

8917. Can you have any hesitation in forming an opinion with respect to its not being worth 10 *l.* a year?—It is not worth 10 *l.* a year.

8918. *Chairman*.] Is it worth 8 *l.*?—I was about stating, there is another man named Lynch in the same neighbourhood; at the time they registered, there was a man named O'Brien, that lived next door to Lynch; O'Brien, Lynch and Kelly: when O'Brien came up to register, Mr. Welch cross-examined him, and he said, "Your worship, it is too bad if those people were admitted." He was speaking to O'Brien, and he said, "What am I to do? you have the swearing of the man; it is worth 10 *l.* to him; what am I to do?" "I do not know," says the other; "I think you have no right to admit him." Then he asked O'Brien, "Now would you leave that house to-morrow for 10 *l.* a year?" "I would," he said, and Mr. Guthrie immediately rejected him; and I was by when Lynch came up afterwards, and Mr. Welch said, "It is the same description of house." The barrister asked him, "would he leave his house for 10 *l.* a year?" he said not, and I do not think there is a more respectable man in the town of Clonmel, of the same rank, than Nicholas Lynch. I do not think, in his rank, there is a more respectable tradesman in the town.

8919. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know Lynch's rent?—I should think about 3 *l.* as well as I recollect.

8920. And

8920. And I presume his house is not in value 10 *l.* a year?—No, I would not say it is. I recollect Mr. Guthrie putting the same question to him, after O'Brien was rejected, "Would you leave the house for 10 *l.* a year?" and his answer was, "I would not."

8921. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then he considered it worth 10 *l.* a year to him?—Yes.

8922. *Chairman.*] And it was on that ground that you believe Mr. Guthrie to have admitted him?—It was, for he rejected O'Brien for a house of the very same description.

8923. Notwithstanding that, your impression is, that Lynch and O'Brien's premises are not worth 10 *l.* a year?—No.

8924. Nor Keily's?—No.

8925. Who did Lynch and Keily vote for?—Lynch voted for Mr. Ronayne, and Keily for Mr. Bagwell; and Keily was brought over here; he got a bribe of 10 *l.*, and he came over to give evidence before the Committee; he got 10 *l.*

8926. From whom?—From Mr. Edward Labarte, Mr. Bagwell's conducting agent.

8927. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did he not vote at the last election for Mr. Ronayne?—He did.

8927*. So that it was at the first election that he voted for Mr. Bagwell?—Yes.

8928. And therefore he became a convert afterwards?—He did.

8929. *Chairman.*] Who did he get the 10 *l.* from the last time?—The liberals were too poor in Clonmel.

8930. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] I believe there never was an imputation upon the liberal candidates for bribing voters?—I never heard of one.

8931. So that whatever may be the imputation on the liberals in Clonmel, no man ever yet dreamt of their bribing at an election?—It was well known that they could not bribe, if they were ever so well inclined.

8932. Mr. Miles Gaskell.] Have the liberals in Clonmel ever been accused of threatening exclusive dealing?—I do not recollect; I know, at the time immediately after the election, that party feeling ran very high between them, and they said that they would not deal with them; however the thing died away after a short time; some individuals might have kept it up.

8933. There were lists published in the town, warning people, not to be dealt with, were there not?—There was not; it was never published in Clonmel; I would have seen it if there were; there were lists of all those that voted for Mr. Ronayne and Mr. Bagwell.

8934. Were not the names of the gentlemen who voted for Mr. Bagwell included in a list?—There was a list, I believe, but it was never published.

8935. There was some peculiar mark by which it was intended to designate the Catholic voters that voted for Mr. Bagwell, was there not?—There was.

8936. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] I believe such things are not unusual at elections in Ireland?—No, indeed they are not.

8937. When party runs very high, and men's blood is very warm, men are apt to do things they would not do if they were calm?—They are so.

8938. Mr. Miles Gaskell.] There was a black list, was there not, giving a sort of designation of the Catholic voters; the liberal party wished to show who the Catholic tradesmen were who voted for Mr. Bagwell?—No, not the tradesmen; they were people who expected they would buy things of them.

8939. Mr. Hamilton.] Was there any black list on the other side, on the side of the Catholics?—No.

8940. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] There were only two out of 1,000 that did not do their duty, was not that so?—Yes.

8941. Now James Gleeson, in Gravel-walk, do you know his premises?—I do.

8942. Do you apply the same observation to him as to Nicholas Lynch and Thomas Keily?—His house is a better house, but I would not say it is worth 10 *l.* a year; I do not think it is.

Mr. Dennis Walsh
and
Mr. P. J. Kelly.
4 May 1837.

8943. And I believe he voted for Mr. Ronayne?—He did.
8944. Do you apply the same observation to Richard Butler's premises, in Gravel-walk?—I would not take on me to say they are worth 10 l. a year.
8945. And he also voted for Mr. Ronayne?—He did.
8946. But, however, do you consider the house of Richard Butler as better than the others?—It is better than Lynch's and Kelly's; I do not think it is better than Gleeson's.
8947. But still you would not take on you to say it is worth 10 l. a year?—I would not.
8948. The same observation applies to Timothy Carey's premises, in Cherry-tree-lane?—The very same.
8949. You cannot say they are worth 10 l. a year?—No.
8950. To Martin Moroney, of Henry-street?—I would not take on me to say they are worth 10 l. a year.
8951. He voted for Mr. Ronayne also?—Carey voted for Mr. Bagwell, but Moroney for Mr. Ronayne.
8952. John Hennessy, in Hopkins-lane?—He voted for Mr. Bagwell; I would not take on me to say that his was worth 10 l. a year.
8953. Are you quite certain he voted for Mr. Bagwell on both occasions?—Yes, he did; he would vote for whoever paid him best.
8954. Mr. Bagwell paid better then, do you mean, or somebody for him?—He did.
8955. Recollect, John Hennessy I am speaking of; you say you are quite certain he voted, on both occasions, for Mr. Bagwell. Now, attend to this; Mr. Joseph Higgins, (number 2807): "Do you know John Hennessy?—He lives in Hopkins-lane: several of those persons that I have named have not voted upon any particular side; they have voted for both sides; but I have determined not to make any distinction between parties; John Hennessy and several of the others have voted for both sides. What do you conceive the value of Hennessy's house to have been at the period of the registration?—Six pounds." Is it true that John Hennessy has voted for both sides?—It is not.
8956. Then the impartiality of Mr. Joseph Higgins appears by this answer; it is shown by his pointing out John Hennessy's premises as being under the value of 10 l., and his having voted on both sides; you say he voted on both occasions for Mr. Bagwell?—He did on both occasions vote for Mr. Bagwell.
8957. Now, do you know John Flanagan, of White's-lane?—I do.
8958. Well now, do you make the same observation as to his premises?—I was by when that man registered.
8959. But do you consider his premises worth 10 l. a year?—I do not; he was asked, and he said it was worth to him 10 l. a year; and the barrister asked him then, would he leave it for 10 l.; and he said he would not.
8960. Mr. Hamilton.] And he was admitted?—He was.
8961. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And he voted for Mr. Ronayne?—Yes.
8962. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you recollect whether he stated what his weekly rent was?—It was by the year; I have it from his landlord; he was a yearly tenant; I believe he pays but 3 l. or 4 l. a year.
8963. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Are you aware that in Clonmel it is quite a usual thing for persons who are yearly tenants to pay their rent weekly?—They pay weekly and monthly.
8964. That is to say, some pay weekly, some monthly?—Yes.
8965. Although they are yearly tenants?—Yes.
8966. And it is quite a usual thing?—It is; a great number of persons pay their rent weekly and monthly.
8967. Do you know John O'Brien's premises in Hopkins-lane?—No; I do not know them.
8968. Do you know James Bardin's?—No, I do not know them.
8969. Walter Bowles's I have already examined you about?—Yes.
8970. Michael Murphy's premises?—I would not take on myself to say they are the same as Bowles's, the same description of premises.
8971. What

8971. What is your evidence as to the value of Bowles's?—That it is not worth, I do not consider Bowles's worth 10 *l.* a year.

8972. Then Michael Murphy's, what do you say to his?—It is the very same. I suppose it would be worth about 8 *l.* a year.

8973. He voted for Mr. Ronayne?—He did.

8974. Now John Coghlan of Boreheens, what do you say to him?—He has left; he is living in Liverpool now.

8975. But his premises?—They were not worth 10 *l.* a year; a wretched cabin it is.

8976. Now Joseph Burke, in Bagwell-street, do you know his premises?—I do.

8977. Did you give any evidence with respect to these premises before?—No, I did not.

8978. Were you present when he registered?—I was.

8979. Did you hear him state that he had the exclusive right of passage to the hall-door?—I did; and his landlord, the man whom he took the place from, swore to the same.

8980. And that he paid 10 *l.* a year?—Yes; before he was admitted the landlord was sent for, and I believe he came up and swore he had the exclusive right to the hall-door.

8981. Are you aware that it is quite a common practice in Clonmel for the owner of a shop to make use of the shop-door for the entrance into the shop, and for the owners of the lodgings in other parts of the house to make use of the hall-door exclusively?—I am; I always myself make use of the shop-door.

8982. And on Sundays do you make use of the shop-door to come in and out?—I do.

8983. And that is the common practice in Clonmel?—It is.

8984. And to leave the exclusive use of the hall-door to the lodger?—It is.

8985. *Chairman.*] Do you allow the lodger to come in at the shop-door?—I would.

8986. But do you make a bargain with the lodger that you will not use the hall-door?—No, I do not.

8987. *Mr. Sergeant Ball.*] You do not let lodgings?—No.

8988. *Chairman.*] But do you mean to say that that is a usual term in the bargain with lodgers in Clonmel, that they shall have the exclusive use of the hall-door, exclusive of the letter of the lodging?—With some persons it is, as I just stated; I was by when he came up to register, and the landlord came up and swore that Burke had the exclusive right to the hall-door, and the barrister admitted him immediately.

8989. Then that being so, attend to this evidence of Mr. William Smith, (number 3990); speaking of Burke, he says, "Burke occupied three rooms, as well as I recollect; I have been in the rooms frequently with him, but decidedly the value of the premises was 40 *l.* a year. Was he a weekly tenant or a yearly tenant?—I think a monthly tenant, perhaps a yearly tenant; I am not satisfied as to that. But he had no entrance that was peculiar to himself?—No, the hall-door was in common to the entire house." Now, Sir, is that the fact or not?—It is not; I heard both Burke and Prendergast swear distinctly, that Burke had the exclusive right to the hall-door, and that Prendergast had no claim to it at all.

8990. Then that being so, attend to the following question: "If the shop-door was shut, how would the landlord get in?—Through the hall-door. The shop-door is sometimes shut by day and night?—Yes, and on Sundays!" Now is that the practice?—No, the shop-doors are generally open on a Sunday; there may be some who have them closed, but the shop-doors are generally open on a Sunday.

8991. Accordingly, you do not concur in that statement either?—I do not.

8992. Now Prendergast, he occupies part of the same house?—He does.

8993. And he was the landlord who corroborated Burke's statement, as to the exclusive right to the hall-door?—He was.

Mr. Denis Walsh
and
Mr. P. J. Kelly.

4 May 1837.

8994. Now as to Sullivan, who occupied the cellar, what do you say to him?—
I would not take on me to say the cellar was worth 10 l.

8995. He voted for Mr. Roanynne, I believe?—He did.

8996. What do you say to Bartholomew Fennessy's premises. Do you know
his premises?—I do.

8997. Mr. Serjeant Ball to Mr. Kelly]. What are his premises valued at in
the book?—At 7 l.

8998. (To Mr. Walsh.) Now attend to this evidence of Mr. Smith, (3200)?—
“Do you know Bartholomew Fennessy of Irishtown, miller?—I was present at
the time he registered, and he was questioned with respect to his hold upon the
premises; the premises were divided at the time; Mr. Walsh was instructed that he
held but part of the premises, and he swore that he paid 10 l. or 10 l. 10 s. for them,
and then he was registered out of the entire premises. At that period he had two
rooms and the yard lot, and the place that he occupied. I think there is no
person that would give more than 7 l. for it; but if he was at liberty to register
out of the entire concern, decidedly it was well worth 10 l.” Now having heard
that evidence, and having heard that these premises are valued at only 7 l. in
the book, what do you say as to the accuracy of that valuation?—I think you
read Mr. Smith was by at the registry, and that part of the premises were set.

8999. I will come to that by and by; but I am speaking now of the difference
between Smith's evidence as to the value and the valuation in that book; do you
observe Mr. Smith states that no person would give more than 7 l. for it, that is,
for the part he occupied, the two rooms and the yard; but if he were at liberty
to have registered out of the entire, it was well worth 10 l.; do you observe the
valuation of the entire is only 7 l.2?—I do.

9000. Is that another instance of the inaccuracy of that valuation?—It is.

9001. Now I come to what you called my attention to; he says, “I was
present at the time he registered, and he was questioned with respect to his hold
upon the premises; the premises were divided at the time.” Do you know the
fact as to the division of the premises?—I do; I was by when the man registered.

9002. He held the whole house himself?—He did.

9003. You know the fact?—I do; and he gave his daughter part of the shop,
and put her into a little huxtering business, and slept in the house where she
did, himself. The house was not divided at all; he only gave her the use of
a small shop.

9004. Did that occur after or before the registry, what you now state?
Before.

9005. Before the registry, did I understand you to say, he gave up to his
daughter the use of only a part of the shop?—He gave her only the use of part
of the shop, and he stated so at the registry.

9006. But he had not divided the premises?—No, he had not.

9007. Did he state he continued still to pay the entire rent?—He did.

9008. Did he say whether his daughter was answerable to him for any rent
or not?—No, he only gave to her the use of it.

9009. Gratuitously?—Here are his receipts from his landlord (*handing these
in*), and he continues still to pay the rent to his landlord.

9010. Then do you say that this statement of Mr. William Smith's, that the
premises were divided at the time of the registry, is not correct?—It is not.

9011. You know that fact?—I do myself.

9012. Chairman.] These receipts which you have handed in are of the date
of 1817?—Yes; he paid 14 l. a year. They have remained in my possession
ever since I came over to give evidence before the Committee in 1833.

Veneris, 5^a die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.
Mr. O'Connell.
Mr. M. J. O'Connell.
Sir Robert Ferguson.
Mr. Milnes Gaskell.

Mr. Hamilton.
Mr. Serjeant Jackson.
Mr. Lefroy.
Lord Granville Somerset.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. *Dennis Walsh* called in; and further Examined.

9013. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] YOU recollect I examined you yesterday about the premises belonging to Paul Winberry?—I do.

9014. I believe I did not refer yesterday to the evidence of Mr. George Graham, in relation to Paul Winberry's premises?—No.

9015. I think you stated they were worth 10*l.* a year?—I did.

9016. And that that rent could be got for them if they were now to be let?—I did.

9017. I called your attention also to the passage in Mr. Higgins's evidence, in which he stated the value to be from 6*l.* to 7*l.* at the outside; do you recollect that?—You did.

9018. And I also called your attention to the fact, that they were valued at 7*l.* in the valuation book?—You did.

9019. Chairman, to Mr. Keily]. Have you prepared the list appearing in a certain paper that was given to you, and have you put opposite to the names therein contained the rates at which they are valued in the commissioners' books?—I did yesterday; and I gave that paper with the book to Mr. Dyson.

9020. Mr. Serjeant Ball, to Mr. Walsh]. It was 7*l.*, I think, the valuation in the book; was it not?—Yes.

9021. Now will you attend to this evidence of Mr. George Graham, No. 5136: "Do you know the premises occupied by Paul Winberry, in Catherine-street? I do. Describe them? It is a very small house, and in very bad condition indeed; it has now been improved, for the roof has been recently repaired, with a small yard to it. Can you state the dimensions? It is fifteen feet front, and twenty feet deep. Did you measure it? I did, and received rent for it for some years for another person. For whom? For Miss Flanagan. Was the rent paid by Mr. Winberry? Not for the last four or five years. What rent was Winberry liable to? He had been leased to it at ten guineas a year; but the place was not worth it; his landlady cancelled the lease, he being in arrears something over 20*l.*; she forgave him these arrears if he only gave up the premises; she cancelled the lease, and gave the premises to him by the year at 8*l.* or guineas. And this you know as the agent for the proprietor? Yes, at the time. When did that take place? About twelve months ago, I think. Then up to that period he paid ten guineas a year rent? It was lessed to him, but he did not pay it. But, however, the rent that he was liable to pay was ten guineas? It was. When was that lease made? The lease was made about twenty years ago. Then, of course, at the time when he registered his rent was ten guineas a year? He was leased at ten guineas a year. He was registered, I believe? He was. He is a butcher, is he not? He is. And there is a slaughter-house annexed to the premises? There is, such a one as that of Myers. It is now indeed pretty fair; for since the rent was reduced he has repaired the roof of it, and he has made it now for him a very fair slaughter-house." And then there are other matters as to the cancelling the lease, which are not material. Now you observe there that Graham states that the rent at present is 8*l.* or 8 guineas?—He does.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

5 May 1837.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.
5 May 1835.

9022. And you recollect that Mr. Higgins's statement was, on his valuation, that from 6*l.* to 7*l.* at the outside was the full value?—Yes.
9023. And you recollect also, that 7*l.* was the value in the book?—I do.
9024. Now, I wish you to say whether you do not see in those three pieces of evidence, first of all, another instance of the inaccuracy of that book?—Indeed, so far as I have seen it, that is not a correct valuation at all.
9025. But in this particular instance you observe, at the time that valuation was made, according to Mr. Graham's evidence, the premises let at ten guineas a year, and they are entered in the book at seven?—Yes.
9026. And you observe at the time of the examination of Mr. Graham, at the time he gave his evidence here, he puts it to be 8*l.* or 8 guineas?—He does.
9027. And finally, you observe that Higgins states it to be at the outside 6*l.* or 7*l.*?—I do.
9028. Now are you aware, that upon this reduction from 10 guineas to 8*l.* or 8 guineas, there was an agreement entered into by Winbury with his landlady, to put a new roof on the premises, and keep it in repair: are you aware of any agreement of that kind?—He told me of the two sisters. I think there was some dispute, the one claiming the property from the other, as well as I recollect; however, he got a reduction, or he could not have got his house slated at all. It was certainly in a bad way until he got the reduction in the rent. By the former agreement they were obliged to keep the premises in repair, and they did not.
9029. Who were obliged to keep the premises in repair?—The two Misses Flanagan.
9030. They were obliged to keep the house in repair for the tenant?—Yes; they did not do so, and so I believe he refused paying the rent, and they came to an understanding that he was to give 8*l.* and to build the slaughter-house.
9031. That is to say, they agreed to reduce the rent to 8*l.* or 8 guineas?—As well as I recollect it was 8*l.*
9032. And on the other hand he agreed to put a new roof upon it, and to keep it in repair?—He did.
9033. It having been previously agreed between him and those ladies that they should keep it in repair?—Yes.
9034. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you know whether the arrears were paid on the reduction of the rent?—The arrears were forgiven him; he told me so himself, the arrears were forgiven him.
9035. Mr. Lefroy.] Was it the tenant told you this?—Yes.
9036. When had you this conversation with him?—A short time before I came over here; I suppose about three weeks ago.
9037. Then you went to prepare yourself as a witness for this purpose?—I did.
9038. And you apprized the tenant you were coming to give this evidence?—I did.
9039. He is one of the liberal party, is he not?—He is.
9040. He told you all this story that you have mentioned to us?—He did; he told it to other persons as well as to me.
9041. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you mean before you called on him?—Yes.
9042. Mr. Lefroy.] How do you know that?—He told me so himself.
9043. Then it is his authority that you have for saying he told it to others?—Yes. I think I heard him say he told it to Mr. Higgins.
9044. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did you hear this story so far back as the year 1833, when you were before examined about the petition?—No; I do not think I heard about the reduction then, he was paying 10 guineas then. I had some of his receipts with me at the time.
9045. Now I examined you yesterday as to certain premises that you said, without any hesitation, you did not consider worth 10*l.* a year; I will just mention a few others without resting upon them. John Collins, do you know his premises in Sherlock's-lane?—I do.
9046. Do you consider them worth 10*l.* a year?—I would not take on me to say that they are.
9047. Now do you know William Burke's premises in Duckett-street?—I do.
9048. Now can you describe them?—I can.
9049. Will you be so good to do so?—A kitchen and two rooms on the first floor,

floor, and there are two rooms up stairs, a yard and pig-house; they are all the same houses, the same as Boyd's.

9050. Did you give evidence relating to Boyd's before?—I did, yesterday.

9051. And what others of the same character?—A man of the name of Patrick Hickey.

9052. And was there a person of the name of Wholohan, who has a house of the same character?—Yes; he has left and Hickey has left too, and Ryan is dead.

9053. Now what do you consider to be the value of those premises of William Burke?—I think they are worth 10*l.*

9054. You have no doubt they are worth 10*l.* a year?—I have not.

9055. Then is it your impression that if they were to be let now, that 10*l.* a year would be obtained for them?—According as the tenants leave them there is an advance put on them.

9056. What do you mean by that?—More rent, from 10*s.* to a pound more, the landlord has put on them.

9057. Do you mean increased the rent?—Yes; increased the rent.

9058. According as the tenants leave them?—According as the tenants leave them he raises the rent.

9059. Why so?—To get more, because he considers they were set too cheap when he set them before.

9060. In point of fact, what rent does William Burke pay?—8*l.*

9061. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you mean Irish or English currency?—Late currency.

9062. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then this is one of the houses which you gave evidence about yesterday?—Yes.

9063. And the landlord raises the rent, you say, according as the tenants leave?—Yes; to 8*l.* 10*s.* British.

9064. Then the rent being 8*l.* 10*s.* British, have you any hesitation in saying you consider the premises worth 10*l.* a year to the tenant?—I have not. One of them was registered at the last sessions; the harrister was obliged to have one or two persons to prove they were of the value of 10*l.*; that was Mr. Howley.

9065. Who was the man that registered?—James Manning.

9066. And the value of this house underwent strict investigation?—It did.

9067. Witnesses called?—Witnesses called.

9068. And the harrister was satisfied?—He was.

9069. And admitted him?—Yes.

9070. Chairman.] It is not William Burke's house you are talking of?—No; one of the same size.

9071. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Does he pay the same rent?—He does; he is one of those that have been advanced; he pays 8*l.* 10*s.* British.

9072. Who does?—James Manning. The tenant that was in it before Manning paid but 8*l.* Irish, and he is obliged to pay 8*l.* 10*s.* British now.

9073. And you state that that house of Manning was not more valuable than William Burke's?—There is a small slaughter-house built there.

9074. Chairman.] In addition?—Yes.

9075. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] On Manning's premises?—Yes.

9076. What difference do you consider that that makes in the value?—Indeed I do not know that it would make much difference; I suppose 10*s.* a year at the most.

9077. But you say you have no hesitation in stating that William Burke's, even without the slaughter-house, is worth 10*l.* a year?—It is indeed; for those houses are quite convenient to the barracks, and they carry on the butchering business some of them and set lodgings.

9078. Chairman.] What is William Burke by profession?—A labourer.

9079. And what is Manning by profession?—Manning is a butcher. William Burke always voted for Mr. Bagwell.

9080. I was going to ask you whether the house being let to a butcher is likely to cause an increase in the value of the house or not?—I do not think it would; for he cannot sell meat there; he must go to the shambles. He might kill there.

9081. Then the rent was raised on William Burke?—It is raised on every one, according as the house becomes vacant; every person is obliged to pay 8*l.* 10*s.* British instead of 8*l.* Irish. I do not know that he raised it as much as he could; Mr. Duckett is a very good landlord. He raised it from 8*l.* Irish to 8*l.* 10*s.* British.

9082. But as much as he could, taking into consideration the solvency of his tenant?

Mr. Denis H. White.

5 May 1837.

tenant?—Of course he might look to that; but I think he could get more for it if he chose.

9083. From a solvent tenant?—I think he could.

9084. Why do you think he could get more from a solvent tenant?—Because I know houses of the same description set in the town, and they get 10*l.* or 10 guineas for them.

9085. In a similar situation?—Some of them are. There is a street convenient to it (Wellington-street); Mr. Jones could get ten guineas for them, and he sets them at 8*l.* 10*s.*

9086. Do you think it an extraordinary thing that a person should say a house was valued at 8*l.* 10*s.* if that happened to be the rent?—I do not.

9087. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] A person who considered rent and value synonymous, that is to say, meaning the same thing, would of course, if he knew the rent was 10*s.*, say that was the value?—He would.

9088. *Chairman.*] But in this case of William Burke, I suppose you are aware that Mr. William Smith states his rent is 7*l.* 7*s.* 9*d.*?—That may be; I believe that is very near 8*l.* late currency.

9089. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Your evidence being, that the landlord raises the rent of these houses, as the tenants leave them, to 8*l.* 10*s.* and Mr. William Smith being aware of that fact, he can have no hesitation in saying he knows the value to be 8*l.* 10*s.*, because he knew that would be the rent if William Burke was to leave it; is not that so?—It is.

9090. Now I think you just said that William Burke voted twice for Mr. Bagwell?—He did.

9091. At the two elections?—He did.

9092. Now 3308, the evidence of Mr. William Smith: "Was not William Burke one of Mr. Bagwell's men? I believe he was. I have great doubts about it, whether he did not vote one time against Mr. Bagwell, and another time for him." Now have you any doubt about it?—I have not; he always voted for Mr. Bagwell.

9093. Now what is the value in the valuation book for this?—It appears to be 6*l.* in the book.

9094. You state, then, that the valuation of this house in the book is 6*l.*?—Yes.

9095. And you have heard the evidence of Mr. William Smith, that he values it at 8*l.* 10*s.*?—I have.

9096. And you know the fact, that this rent is 8*l.* Irish?—8*l.* Irish.

9097. Then do you see in those three circumstances another instance of the extreme inaccuracy of that valuation?—I do.

9098. Do you know James Wholohan's premises in Duckett-street?—I do.

9099. Is that of the same character as the other; the same description of house as the other?—It is something better; there are two sheds built upon that backwards.

9100. *Chairman.*] You call them Linneys?—Yes.

9101. Since when has he made these sheds?—Before he was registered, in the year 1832.

9102. You are quite sure of that?—I am.

9103. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Are you quite sure the improvement by building slated linneys—are they slated?—They are.

9104. Are you quite sure that improvement was before he registered?—Yes.

9105. Now, being so, will you attend to this evidence of Mr. Smith: "James Wholohan of Duckett-street? He has a better house than Burke has, but at the time that he registered it was not; but he has since improved it by building slated linneys which he lets to lodgers. At the time that he registered it was not better than Burke's." You have heard that?—I have.

9106. Do you agree in that statement?—I do not. James Wholohan was obliged to leave; and some few days after he voted at the first election he had his things seized.

9107. Who did he vote for?—Mr. Ronayne.

9108. Who was the person who seized?—His landlord.

9109. What was his name?—Mr. or Miss Duckett, I don't know which.

9110. Were they both in the interest of the corporation?—They were.

9111. Both conservatives?—Yes.

9112. You said he had his things seized?—Yes.

9113. And he was obliged to leave the premises?—He was.

9114. Do you call that freedom of election in Clonmel?—I do not.

9115. Sir

9115. Sir Robert Ferguson.] Is that the Duckett you have already spoken of, as being a very good landlord?—It is Miss Duckett I believe; they both had the property.

9116. Is it the person you have already spoken of, as being a good landlord?—Yes; but any person who voted at that election, I believe it is well known, Mr. Duckett was very severe and particular with them.

9117. Mr. O'Connell.] You mean persecuted them?—Yes.

9118. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you know other instances in which that has occurred?—There was a man of the name of Atkins, but Mr. Duckett had nothing to do with that.

9119. Mr. O'Connell.] Who persecuted Atkins for his vote?—I believe it was Mr. Graham, who was the agent of Miss Flanagan.

9120. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Do you know what rent was due to Miss Duckett?—I do not; I heard, I think, it was half a year's rent.

9121. You are not quite sure?—I am not quite sure.

9122. What rent was due to the landlord of Atkins?—I do not know; I know there was rent due.

9123. Do landlords in Clonmel distrain at any other times besides after elections?—They were very particular immediately after the election.

9124. Do they distrain, my question is, at any other time?—Of course they do.

9125. Then if a landlord happens to distrain after an election it must be persecution, must it?—I know several cases of persecution; I know the lord of the soil—

9126. If a landlord should happen to distrain after an election has occurred, must that necessarily be persecution?—I say immediately after an election, that any landlord that would go and seize and sell out for half a year's rent I think would be very severe.

9127. But suppose then a person that is a very good landlord, that that is his reputation, and he happens to distrain for rent, and I cannot tell what the amount of the arrears may be, but suppose he happens to distrain for rent after an election has taken place, must that necessarily be persecution?—I was about stating I know a landlord myself—

9128-9. Will you answer that question first?—I certainly think that it would be where a man owes but half a year's rent. I knew a landlord myself, the lord of the soil (Mr. Bagwell), to direct his agent to serve a writ upon a respectable man for 1 *l.* 19 *s.* or 2 *l.* 9 *s.* immediately after the first election.

9130. Mr. O'Connell.] By which you mean a writ from the superior court?—Yes; and ran him to 3 *l.* 12 *s.* or 14 *s.* expense.

9131. Chairman.] For rent due?—Yes.

9132. For half a year's rent?—No, I believe it was a year's rent; it was the ground rent.

9133. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And the cost of the writ I think you say was 3 *l.* 12 *s.*?—I think it was 3 *l.* 12 *s.* or 14 *s.*

9134. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Was the house he lived in a valuable house?—I should suppose it is worth sixty guineas a year.

9135. And there was a year's rent due to Mr. Bagwell?—I believe it was a year's rent. The tenant had it, I think, for 3 *l.* a year ground rent; he built the concerns himself, and sunk a tan-yard.

9136. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you know whether any demand was made upon him before he was served with the writ?—Never.

9137. How did he vote?—He voted for Mr. Ronayne.

9138. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But if the ground rent was 3 *l.* a year, and the writ was only for 1 *l.* 19 *s.*, it could not have been a year's rent that was due?—*l.* 1. 19 *s.* or 2 *l.* 9 *s.* was what was due.

9139. It was a fractional part of a year's rent?—Yes; and immediately afterwards the first thing that he did, five or six days after his voting, was to have him served with a writ.

9140. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Is that man living?—He is.

9141. What is his name?—Lawrence Davis.

9142. But you do not know anything about there not being a demand upon him?—I saw the receipt; he went and paid the costs to Mr. Labarte.

9143. But as to a demand being made, do you know anything about that except what he told you?—No.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

8 May 1837.

9144. Do you know anything from any quarter except what he told you?—I heard several persons speak of it; one man was a very respectable man.

9145. Have you any other means of knowledge of that fact save his telling you so?—I heard different persons speak of it. It was a subject that every person in Clonmel spoke of; they were surprised that Mr. Bagwell would treat any respectable man in the way he did, by having a latitat served on him for 1 l. 19 s. or 2 l. 9 s., I do not know which.

9146. *Chairman.*] You never heard Mr. Bagwell speak of it himself?—I heard Mr. Edward Laharte, who was examined here the other day, say he gave him directions to proceed against several persons, and I know he after the first election proceeded against a father and daughter.

9147. Who was that?—Patrick O'Donel.

9148. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] They had two writs served upon them?—Yes.

9149. *Mr. O'Connell.*] At whose suit?—Mr. Bagwell's; served by Mr. Edward Laharte.

9150. Was Patrick O'Donel a voter?—He was.

9151. He voted for Mr. Romayne?—He voted for Mr. Romayne.

9152. Is the spirit of party (conservative spirit) higher in Clonmel, or more violent than it was before the emancipation?—It is much more violent now than it was before emancipation; party feeling never ran so high as it does now in Clonmel since 1832.

9153. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Mr. Duckett was one of those that are called persecuting landlords, who was the other?—Mr. Bagwell.

9154. Can you state the names of any voters who hold property under Mr. Duckett?—That Wholohan held under him.

9155. Who else?—A man named Boyd.

9156. Who else?—And a man named Hickey; he is gone out.

9157. Any other?—A man named Rym; he is dead.

9158. Any other?—I do not recollect any other. There were several new houses that Mr. Duckett has built besides, very little larger than the others, and he is getting ten guineas a year for them.

9159. What other houses?—The houses that pay 8 l. 10 s.

9160. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Then I presume with respect to those voters in the adverse interest on Mr. Duckett's property, it is your opinion that rent and value at all events must be synonymous with respect to them?—I do not think it is.

9161. Do you mean that Mr. Duckett, after your statement, would allow people, tenants at will, to occupy at a lower rent than the value?—I know very well there are persons there pay a lower rent; of course he does allow them.

9162. People in the interest of the liberal party?—He cannot get them out.

9163. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Why not?—I do not know; I knew a man named Boyd lived in his house 20 years.

9164. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Does he pay his rent?—If he was not able to pay he would have left it after the late election.

9165. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] Has there been anything of what you would call strict or harsh conduct on the other side of the question towards conservative voters?—I never knew any one to distrain.

9166. There has been no exclusive dealing, or anything of that sort?—No; such a thing was mentioned for I suppose a month or so after the election, but it died away.

9167. By which party was that mentioned?—The liberal electors had a very strong feeling against those of their own party that voted for Mr. Bagwell; and against the Protestants or Quakers.

9168. *Chairman.*] Who do you mean by their own party?—The Roman Catholics.

9169. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] Is your evidence this then, that there has been this harsh and persecuting conduct entirely on the part of the conservative landlords against their tenants, and no harsh or persecuting conduct or exclusive dealing practised?—

Mr. O'Connell submitted that the question had better be separated.

9170. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] Very well. Is it your evidence then, that there has been this harsh conduct on the one side, on the part of the conservatives against the liberals, for their voting at the election, and no corresponding conduct on the part of the liberals against the conservative voters?—I just stated before, that

that for about a month or so, there was a strong feeling kept up against the Roman Catholics who voted for Mr. Bagwell, but not against the Protestants or Quakers.

9171. In what way was that kept up against the Roman Catholics?—That people used not to speak to them; they said they did not wish to hold any intercourse with them at all, in consequence of deserting them and receiving bribes.

9172. I think you said there were forty of them?—I said forty-six.

9173. Do you mean that those forty-six were bribed?—I think there may be three or four that were not, but I am quite satisfied that all the rest had some inducement held out to them to vote for Mr. Bagwell.

9174. Mr. O'Connell.] What do you mean by inducement?—Giving ground, and things, and places for building houses, building ground.

9175. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Did that conduct amount to avoiding any dealing with them?—I said for about a month or so, or probably it might be two months, there was a strong feeling kept up against them.

9176. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Except that, there was no manifestation of displeasure at all on the part of the liberals, as you say, against the conservatives for the part they took in the election?—I never heard of one liberal persecuting a tenant for voting, but, as I said before, there was a strong feeling kept up for a month or two in consequence of their deserting their friends.

9177. Mr. O'Connell.] Do you mean to say the Committee are to understand that there was actual bribery practised in money?—There was.

9178. How many, as you understand, were bribed with money?—There were a great many, a great many.

9179. What was the highest sum?—£.20 was what was generally given. There were two men here who came before the Committee to prove that they were bribed.

9180. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] What were their names?—Mat Butler and Thomas Kelly.

9181. That is, you mean the committee that sat in 1833?—Yes.

9182. Mr. Hamilton.] Had they taken the bribery oath?—No; they did not.

9183. Mr. O'Connell.] In general, the liberal party do not administer the oath?—They do not. In some cases they do.

9184. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] That is the bribery oath?—Yes; the bribery oath. During the late election, or the first, I do not think the bribery oath was put to any Protestant or Quaker in Clonmel.

9185. Mr. Lefroy.] What was the reason of that?—Because they would not take up the time.

9186. Mr. O'Connell.] The Protestants went with their own party without a bribe?—Yes, it is so said.

9187. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] So that administering the oath would be merely taking up the time.

9188. Mr. O'Connell.] You did not suspect the Protestants of having taken bribes?—No.

9189. Are you aware there is any Quaker in Clonmel who belongs to the liberal party?—Not one.

9190. Are you aware that in general, in other places, Quakers are liberal men?—I have heard of some of them being liberal.

9191. In Dublin many are liberal?—I believe so.

9192. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did I understand you to say that you considered the Protestants had sufficient inducement to vote for their own party without taking bribes?—It was said that some of the poor Protestants were paid by Mr. Bagwell for acting as agents, and giving their votes; but I think that they would have all voted with their own party if they did not get a bribe.

9193. That is to say, there was sufficient attachment to their own party, an anxiety to promote their own interest, to account for their voting with them without their taking bribes?—Yes; I think so.

9194. Mr. O'Connell.] The making freemen since the Reform Bill in Clonmel, is to increase the conservative interest?—It is.

9195. Do they look out for conservatives to give them their freedom, and make their sons freemen?—They do. I know a man of the name of Palliser—

9195. Well, what were you about to say; you know a man of the name of Palliser?—I know a man of the name of Palliser, who served a notice as freeman; he went forward to register, and he swore that he served his time with a Mr.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

5 May 1837.

Morton, and he was sent for, and he came forward and swore that Palliser never was bound to him, and he was rejected then.

9197. Who rejected him?—The late Mr. Hobson; and he admitted him the sessions following.

9198. He produced his certificate, I suppose, of admission?—He produced his cocket on the first occasion, and he was rejected; and he produced it the second time and was admitted.

9199. The cocket stated he was made a freeman as an apprentice?—Yes.

9200. And on the second notice, Mr. Hobson considered he was bound to admit him?—He did.

9201. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Did he say anything respecting the former decision upon that subject?—I do not recollect that he did.

9202. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Was on it on the principle that the cocket was conclusive?—Yes; he said that was quite sufficient for him; he would admit him.

9203. Mr. *O'Connell*.] Although it had been proved before him that the man had not been an apprentice?—The master swore he was not bound to him.

9204. And there was no contradiction of the master; was there?—No.

9205. The master was ready to swear it again?—He was indeed; he is a very highly respectable man, there is not one more so in Clonmel.

9206. The master is of the conservative party?—He is.

9207. Then Palliser's appears to you to be a false, fictitious vote?—It does.

9208. That man is registered as an apprentice, although the alleged master, a respectable man, swore positively he had not served him?—Yes; and there is not a more respectable man in Clonmel.

9209. And he swore that positively?—He did; I was by when he swore it.

9210. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Now I come back to this house of James Wolohan; did you not tell me it was a better house than William Burke's?—Yes, it is; there are two sheds built on it.

9211. Now you have told me already you consider William Burke's house well worth 10*l.* a year?—I do.

9212. Then what do you consider to be the value of Wolohan's?—I think it is worth something more than that, because those sheds enhance the value.

9213. Have you any doubt, if it were now to be let, that 10*l.* a year would be obtained for it?—I have not the least doubt.

9214. Will you look to that return, and see what it is valued at in the commissioners' book?—*£. 6.*

9215. Now will you attend to this evidence of Mr. William Smith, (No. 3310); speaking of James Wolohan's premises, he is asked, "Do you value it the same as Burke's? The rent is the same, but James Wolohan was not the owner of the house at the time he registered; his brother John was the owner, and his brother John then went into service; John let the house to lodgers, and he let his brother James in and gave him one room for collecting the weekly rents for him, and he registered then out of the entire house. And he is now the sole proprietor? No, his brother John is still the proprietor. Did they both register out of the house? No; John the owner of the house did not register. Where does the other brother live? He is a servant. His brother did live in it and was registered? Yes. Has he left it since? I believe he has. You would say that at all events the house now is worth 10*l.*? No, I do not think it is." That is Mr. William Smith's evidence; do you agree with him in that statement?—I do not.

9216. Then he goes on, "How much was it worth before the improvement? Answer, 8*l.*" Now, if Mr. William Smith be correct in his statement that the premises were worth 8*l.* before the improvement, do you see in that statement another instance of the inaccuracy of that book, which values them only at 6*l.*?—I do.

9217. You state positively that the improvement took place before the registry?—I do.

9218. Then if they were worth 8*l.* before the improvement and before the registry, supposing you had no other ground of forming a judgment, can you have any hesitation in coming to the conclusion, that after the improvement was made, and before the registry, they must have been worth considerably more than 8*l.*?—I have not the least doubt upon my mind.

9219. The rent, you state, is 8*l.*?—It is.

9220. And was so at the time of that valuation being made in 1828?—Yes.

9221. And yet the valuation is only 6*l.*?—*£. 6.*

9222. Now

9222. Now John Ryan, in Duckett-street, do you know his house?—I do; he is dead. Mr. Dennis Walsh.
9223. But is your evidence the same with reference to his premises as you gave with reference to Wholohan's?—Yes. 5 May 1837.
9224. Wholohan in point of fact has quitted his premises?—He has.
9225. Now in the class of premises with respect to which you do not undertake to state the value to be 10*l.*; do you know Jeremiah Daniel of Dublin-street?—I do.
9226. Can you undertake to say that his premises are worth 10*l.*?—No; I would not.
9227. Do you know William Fennell, of Main-street?—I do.
9228. Are you able to state anything as to that either?—He has left the cellar.
9229. But as to the value?—He was paying 9*l.* a year for it.
9230. What means have you of knowing that?—I brought over the receipt at the time I was coming here in 1833, it remains in my possession still.
9231. You brought over the receipt showing he paid 9*l.*?—Yes.
9232. Did you know that cellar?—I did at that time; I was not in it since; the man left it immediately after.
9233. Have you any doubt if he paid 9*l.* a year rent for it that it was worth 10*l.* a year?—I have not.
9234. Now attend to the evidence of Mr. Graham, (No. 4769); William Fennell is the man's name. It is 4765: "Now as to William Fennell's premises, do you know them? Yes. Is that also a cellar? Yes. Where is that? In the Main-street. Is it a spacious or a confined cellar? It is rather spacious. What value do you set on it? I think from 6*l.* to 7*l.* ought to be about the value." Now you know that he paid 9*l.* rent?—I do; I have it from the landlord.
9235. Then have you any hesitation in saying that the statement of Mr. George Graham, that from 6*l.* to 7*l.* ought to be about the value, must be erroneous?—It must indeed.
9236. Do you know William Heffernan of Main-street?—Yes.
9237. Do you know the premises?—I do.
9238. And you know Heffernan himself?—I do.
9239. What circumstances is he in; do you know his circumstances?—I do.
9240. Now what are his circumstances?—Heffernan has been living in that 32 years.
9241. It is a cellar, is it not?—Yes.
9242. Will you be so good as describe the cellar?—It is a large cellar.
9243. How many apartments?—Two; a room inside the shop.
9244. Is the shop outside and the room within?—The shop outside and the room within.
9245. What is sold in the shop?—Calicoes, lineus, flannels, and different things.
9246. All these in a cellar?—Yes; he married his daughter some years ago, and gave her 300*l.* fortune.
9247. And was that property made in this cellar?—It was.
9248. He has been 32 years there?—Yes.
9249. Is the situation good?—It is one of the best in Clonmel.
9250. To whom did he marry his daughter, do you recollect?—A Mr. Cronin.
9251. What is he?—He is a grocer now, and he buys pigs.
9252. Is he considered worth any money?—He is considered to be wealthy.
9253. Is there much goods in this cellar of Heffernan's?—I suppose there could not have been less than between 200*l.* and 300*l.* worth; I should suppose so.
9254. Do you mean to say generally in it?—Yes, linen and flannels at least a couple of hundred pounds' worth.
9255. He is in an extensive way then?—Yes; there are several cellars in Clonmel that have more goods in them than in some shops.
9256. Than in shops above ground?—Yes.
9257. Then you know the value of the cellar?—I do. I live within a few doors.
9258. What would it let for, if it were now to be let?—My cellar is much smaller, and I could get 9*l.* for it.
9259. And it is within a few doors of it?—It is within a few doors of it.
9260. Then have you any hesitation in saying that that cellar is worth 10*l.* a year?—I have not.
9261. That

Mr. Dennis Walsh,
5 May 1837.

9261. That he could get that for it, if it were now to be let?—He could; he pays either 8 l. or eight guinea; I am not sure which; he commenced paying that 32 years ago.

9262. Now, that being the case, what do you say to this evidence of Mr. George Graham, No. 4787: "Describe the premises of William Heffernan? It is in the Main-street; a cellar also, about 9 feet wide. What depth? I should think it is about from 24 to 28 feet. What do you conceive to be the value? I think the value of it is about 5 l. 10 s. or 6 l.; it is a small cellar, narrow." Now do you agree in that statement of Mr. George Graham?—Indeed, I do not. I had the man's receipts over here, and his next door neighbour's, after the first election. I do not know whether it is 8 l. or eight guinea that he pays.

9263. But the rent being 8 l. or eight guinea, you have no hesitation in saying that Mr. George Graham's statement, that the value is about 5 l. 10 s. or 6 l., is a very gross mis-statement of the fact?—Indeed it is.

9264. Do you know a person of the name of Jeremiah Sullivan, who lived in a cellar very near that, or next it?—I believe he lived in M'Auliffe's cellar.

9265. Was not he supposed to have made a great deal of property in that cellar?—He made over 2,000 l.

9266. Living in that cellar?—Yes.

9267. And trading there?—Yes.

9268. And that is the next cellar to Heffernan's?—Yes; he gave his daughter 700 l. fortune.

9269. Then I call your attention to this evidence of Mr. Graham, that it was a small narrow cellar about nine feet wide, and from 24 to 28 feet deep; do you agree in that statement?—I do not.

9270. Do you know anything of the number of feet?—I should suppose from 13 to 14 feet wide.

9271. And the depth?—There is a counter, then an inside counter, and then shelves for goods inside that again, so that if it were only nine feet wide he could not have any room at all outside.

9272. Would it be possible for him to have a shop nine feet such as is described, with calicoes and flannels, and those things which you describe as occupying a great space?—It would not.

9273. Then the fact is, that, as to this shop, with this quantity of goods in, it would be physically impossible that the cellar should have been only nine feet wide?—It is more; some feet more than that.

9274. How many?—I am quite sure it is 14 feet altogether.

9275. Do you know the premises of Dennis Callaghan in the Main-street?—Daniel Callaghan it is.

9276. That is one of the premises that you do not consider worth 10 l.; is it not?—It is.

9277. Do you know John Costello's premises in the Main-street?—I do.

9278. *Chairman.*] Is that a cellar?—It is.

9279. Mr. Serjeant *Ball.*] Now then, will you describe that cellar?—I will, it is a large cellar.

9280. Well, how many apartments?—Three apartments.

9281. Has it a window?—It has, there are windows in front.

9282. He lets lodgings I believe; beds?—Yes.

9283. How many beds does he let?—Generally six.

9284. Besides that, has he a shop?—He has.

9285. What description?—Sells huxtering.

9286. How long has he resided there?—I do not know, a good many years though; he is a smith.

9287. Is it a good situation?—Very good.

9288. You say he is a smith?—A coach-smith.

9289. But he does not carry on that trade in his cellar of course?—No, he does not; he works for Mr. Bianconi.

9290. Do you know what rent he pays?—£. 7 rent.

9291. Mr. *Lefroy.*] Is that old currency?—No; British currency, present currency.

9292. Mr. Serjeant *Ball.*] Now do you know the value of that cellar?—I do.

9293. And what do you undertake to say with regard to that?—It is second next door to mine; it is the best situation in Cloumel, in the Main-street; the very best situation; there are cellars on the opposite side of the street, though nearly as good and as large, that would not set for within 3 l. of the price of that.

9294. Then

9294. Then this is peculiarly the best situation?—The very best situation in Clonmel. Mr. Dennis Watson.

9295. Have you any hesitation in saying now whether that is worth 10 *l.* a year?—I have not. It is much larger than mine, and I gave 9 *l.* for mine, and half a year's rent in advance.

9295*. And this is much larger and better?—Not a better situation than mine; they are both in the same situation.

9296. Now that being your evidence, attend to the evidence of Mr. George Graham, 4707. "Do you know the premises occupied by John Costello? I do. Will you describe those premises? That is a cellar under George Glasscot's, in the Main-street. How many rooms are there in the cellar, more than one? There are; there are two or three; I have not been in the rooms, but I have been down in the cellar; other occupations sometimes lead me into those cellars. I have the weights and measures of the town of Clonmel in my care; I am inspector of weights and measures, and sometimes it leads me into those places. Are you aware of the value of the rooms in that cellar? The outside value of the whole cellar I take to be not more than about 8 *l.* His landlord told me he pays but 7 *l.* for it." Now do you agree in that statement that the outside value is not more than 8 *l.*?—I do not.

9297. He proceeds: "Do you know whether John Costello is registered or not? He did register out of that cellar and voted. What business does he follow? He is a cooper, but I believe his wife sells little huxtery things, small offal, meat, and things of that sort." Now is that statement true?—It is not.

9298. That John Costello is a cooper?—No, I have seen him work at his trade; a coach-smith.

9299. And you have no doubt he is not a cooper?—I have no doubt at all about it.

9300. Now the examination proceeds: "Do you know the next cellar to Costello's, the next adjoining it? The very next adjoining is Mr. Hackett's. Do you know what rent that pays? I do not. Should you be surprised to hear it pays 12 *l.* a year rent? Very much so." Now do you happen to know what rent Mr. Hackett's cellar pays?—It did pay 16 *l.*; and he could get more than 12 *l.* for it. He gets 12 guineas, and generally gives the woman a Christmas-box of 12 *s.*; he gets 12 guineas for the cellar.

9301. Then what seems to have excited so much surprise in Mr. George Graham does not excite any surprise at all in you?—No indeed, it does not.

9302. *Chairman.*] Do not you say that you have a cellar pretty handy there?—Second next door.

9303. And what rent do you say you could get for it?—I refused 9 *l.* for it, and a year's rent in advance.

9304. Do you hire the cellar or do you let it?—I set it; I am the landlord.

9305. And you refused 9 *l.* for it?—Yes, I did.

9306. *Mr. Jeffrey.*] What do you get for it?—I get 8 *l.*

9307. How came you to refuse 9 *l.*?—Because the man brings me a good many customers; and I would rather give it him for 6 *l.* to-morrow than for 9 *l.* to another person, because he brings me a great many customers.

9308. What is George Glasscot, is he a liberal or a Protestant?—He is a Protestant.

9309. *Chairman.*] Which way did John Costello vote?—For Mr. Ronayne.

9310. And George Glasscot turned out John Costello?—No, he did not.

9311. Then he happens to be a landlord on the conservative side, who allows his tenant to vote as he pleases, does he?—He does.

9312. And allows his tenant to give him 7 *l.* for that which you say is worth 10 *l.*?—Yes. And I should say that Mr. Glasscot himself was very near voting for Mr. Ronayne.

9313. *Mr. Serjeant Bell.*] Then he is very near being a liberal?—Yes; a very little would make him one.

9314. *Mr. Milnes Gaskell.*] He would have made a third liberal Protestant in Clonmel?—I think there was a third Protestant voted at the last election for Mr. Ronayne; at least he is a Scotchman; a Presbyterian.

9315. *Chairman.*] Then, there being two Protestants who voted at the last election?—Two Protestants and a Presbyterian.

9316. But, however, there being two Protestants and a Presbyterian who voted for the liberal party at the last election, were they well or ill treated by their fellow Protestants?—I do not know. There was one of them very badly treated.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

5 May 1837.

9317. How was he treated?—He was a collector of taxes, and he lost his situation.
9318. Mr. Serjeant *Boll*.] What was his name?—Howell, I think.
9319. *Chairman*.] What was he?—A collector of some taxes about the town.
9320. That was by the second set of commissioners, was it?—No, it was set commissioners' tax; there are other taxes about the town.
9321. What other taxes?—Church rates, and different other taxes; county taxes.
9322. Then who were the other two Protestants, were they well treated or not?—I did not hear anything about them.
9323. Mr. *Milnes Gaskell*.] Were they tradesmen?—No; people in business.
9324. *Chairman*.] What business?—They were in the spirit business, and the chandlery.
9325. Do not you call them tradesmen?—No.
9326. Mr. *Milnes Gaskell*.] You never heard they lost any custom in consequence?—I do not think they did.
9327. Mr. Serjeant *Boll*.] Possibly they may have increased their custom on the other side?—I think they have increased their custom.
9328. Then your evidence amounts to this, that a gentleman that very nearly voted for Mr. Ronayne did not persecute his tenant for voting for Mr. Ronayne?—No, he did not. I know he pledged himself, at the first election, not to vote against Mr. Ronayne; but his friends got about him, and induced him to vote for Mr. Bagwell.
9329. Then I say your evidence is, that a person who promised, at the first election, not to vote against Mr. Ronayne, who very nearly voted for him, as I understand you, subsequently did not persecute his tenant for voting for the same Mr. Ronayne?—He did not.
9330. *Chairman*.] And still further, your evidence goes to say he allows his tenant to have his premises for 7 *l.* a year, when they are worth 10 *l.*?—He does.
9331. Mr. Serjeant *Boll*.] In that instance; do you mean to say he does in other instances?—I think he does in other instances.
9332. Then has he several tenants?—He has; and this Costello is a very respectable man. People having cellars to set would much rather get a respectable industrious person than get persons who are continually making a noise, with a large family; he has a small family.
9333. Very quiet?—Very.
9334. And a very desirable tenant?—Yes.
9335. So that Glasscot is very well off in having him. Do you consider he is better off in having him at 7 *l.* than another at 9 *l.* or 10 *l.*?—I know he would prefer having him, knowing him so well; that he would rather have him for that than if he got a larger sum from any one else.
9336. Now have you any more of those nearly-converted conservative landlords in Clonmel?—No; I do not recollect any more.
9337. You cannot specify any more?—I cannot.
9338. Well, did you describe this cellar of John M'Auliffe?—I did not.
9339. Will you describe that?—I will; it is a large shop, and there are four apartments inside.
9340. This is Main-street also?—Yes.
9341. In the same situation?—Yes; within two or three doors of my place.
9342. And that you described as the best situation in Clonmel?—It is.
9343. Is there a shop?—There is; and a sitting room inside, and there is a small ware-room inside that, a bed inside that, and a small ware-room again inside that.
9344. And that you described as a very spacious cellar?—Yes; very large.
9345. Is he a respectable man?—He is very respectable indeed.
9346. Thriving?—Yes, he is.
9347. And industrious?—Industrious.
9348. And in good circumstances?—Very good circumstances.
9349. How long has he been in possession?—I dare say ten or eleven years; I suppose ten years in possession.
9350. Do you know what rent he pays?—I do.
9351. What is it?—Eight guineas; 9 *l.* 2 *s.* late currency.
9352. Now was that the cellar that was occupied by Sullivan, who you told me made 2,000 *l.* in it?—It is

9354. It is the same premises?—Yes; he follows the same business.

9355. Now you told me of Heffernan, who gave his daughter 300 l.?—Yes.

9356. Did M'Auliffe marry his daughter?—He has no children; he succeeded the man that Heffernan's daughter was married to.

9357. I believe that that cellar is lighted, is it not?—It is.

9358. By a window?—There are two windows in it.

9359. *Chairman.*] Do you mean to state positively there is a window in front?—No; but there is a window at the end when you get into the room, and then there is in the small ware-room another window.

9360. There is no light in front?—No window in front.

9361. How deep is it?—I should suppose the shop and room are above 30 feet; I should suppose so, the shop and the room is at least 30 feet.

9362. And how wide is it?—I should say about 16 feet. I think it is at least that, from 14 to 16 feet.

9363. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] What reason have you for speaking so correctly as to the dimensions?—I examined it before I came over here, and I examined it in the year 1833 also.

9364. And did the result of your examination in the year 1833 correspond with your examination the other day?—It did.

9365. Now, that being your evidence, have you any hesitation in saying what the cellar is worth, whether it is worth 10 l. a year or not?—I am quite satisfied that that cellar would not be one day unset, and he would get 12 l. a year for it.

9366. Now, that being so, be so good as attend to this evidence of Mr. George Graham, (4821): "Are you acquainted with the premises of John M'Auliffe? I am. Describe the premises? It is a cellar about nine feet wide, it is about 20 feet deep, no light except by the entrance, and its utmost value I take to be about 6 l." Now, is it true that the dimensions of that cellar are about 9 feet wide and 20 feet deep?—I think Mr. Graham must have made a mistake, or he never could have stated that.

9367. You apprehend he was inaccurate, but not intentionally?—I certainly think he would not state such a thing as that if he knew the cellar.

9368. Then you apprehend it must be an inaccuracy, but not intentional, because you consider the inaccuracy so glaring?—It is.

9369. *Mr. Legray.*] Is there any light but by the entrance?—There are two windows behind, but no light in front.

9370. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Is it the fact that there is no light except by the entrance?—There is a window at the back of the room; and inside, in the other room, there is another window.

9371. Then it is not the fact that there is no light except by the entrance?—It is not.

9372. *Sir Robert Ferguson.*] Then there are rooms behind the cellar?—There are three or four; four.

9373. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Then Mr. Graham goes on: "Its utmost value I take to be about 6 l." Now, is it your estimate that 12 l. could be got for it immediately if it were unset?—I have no hesitation in saying that it would not be one day unset, and 12 l. would be had for it.

9374. Again, he is asked: "Have you been there for the purpose of valuation? I have been there for the purpose of looking at it and inspecting it, that I might judge of its value; I went into it, having a double object in view. State the objects? To examine measures, and to see the size of the cellar. When were you there?" and so on. Now, from reading that, and from hearing that last statement of Mr. Graham, and the former statement as to the dimensions of the cellar, is it your impression that Mr. Graham never went beyond the shop, and did not go into the back apartments at all?—He did not state anything about the four rooms.

9375. He states nothing about any number of apartments, and he states there is no light: and is it your impression, from reading that evidence, that Mr. Graham never went beyond the shop?—I am quite satisfied no man in his senses would state it if he went beyond the shop; he would not state it; my opinion is, he would not state it. The rooms are one after another; there are three rooms one after the other.

9376. And accordingly this statement of Mr. Graham, that he went into it, having a double object in view, you do not consider the most accurate mode of ascertaining the value of the cellar, by going in with a double object in view?—I do not, indeed.

Mr. Dennis Watkins.

5 May 1897.

9377. You went in with a single object, did you not?—I went in for the purpose of seeing the premises.
9378. And you think that the better way of ascertaining the state of the premises is to go with a single than a double object?—I am quite satisfied, but he stated to M'Auliffe what he wanted, he would have shown him all.
9379. Now, do you know Martin Smith's cellar in the Main-street?—I do.
9380. Describe that cellar; is that the same situation as the other?—It is a few doors below it, about the same situation; there are four or five large apartments in that. He was registered by Mr. Hobson.
9381. Well, Mr. Hobson was not very liberal in registering people out of cellars, unless he saw good ground for it?—No; he was very particular.
9382. Now, will you describe that cellar?—There are four or five large apartments in it.
9383. Well, in point of fact, do you know what rent he pays?—He pays 10 l.
9384. Now, have you any doubt that that cellar, if it were to be let to-morrow, would fetch a much higher rent?—It would.
9385. What would it fetch?—I am sure that cellar would set at 14 l. to-morrow.
9386. You know the rent is 10 l.?—I do.
9387. Now attend to this evidence of Mr. George Graham, (No. 4884): "What do you conceive to be its value? Really I think that cellar is worth 10 l.; it is the best cellar; it is an exception to all others in Clonmel; it covers a considerable extent under a large house, lighted from behind, lighted by a window from the street; and there are vaults, too, under the street, that no other house has." Now, is that accurate?—It is not.
9388. First of all, do you take it to be the best cellar in Clonmel?—No; I think there are as good cellars in Clonmel as that.
9389. "It is an exception to all others in Clonmel; it covers a considerable extent under a large house, lighted from behind." Are there not other cellars that cover a considerable extent under large houses, and lighted from behind?—In M'Auliffe's the cellar is lighted behind.
9390. Well lighted by a window from the street, is that so?—It is.
9391. "There are vaults, too, under the street, that no other house has." Do you say there is no other house that has a vault under the street but this one?—I know two houses that have vaults under the street; there is one house in Main-street, where they generally keep about thirty puncheons of whiskey in the vault under the street.
9392. Sir Robert Ferguson.] Are either of those vaults let with the cellar?—No; they do not let the cellar. They are in the spirit and grocery line.
9393. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then it is not the fact that no other house has a vault under the street except this one?—It is not.
9394. Sir Robert Ferguson.] Is there any other cellar let in Clonmel, that you know, that has vaults under the street?—No, I do not know there is. I know Mr. Stokes has very extensive vaults under the street.
9395. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You say you know as good cellars, do you know Mr. Hockett's cellar?—I do.
9396. Do you consider that as good, or better?—I think that is a better cellar.
9397. I believe Martin Smith is registered out of two cellars?—He is.
9398. And which is the one he is now registered out of, the one we have been describing?—Yes.
9399. And not the other?—And not the other.
9400. Now you observe this evidence of Mr. Graham: "What do you conceive to be the value of the cellar occupied by Martin Smith? About 7 l. or 7 guineas." (4881.) Do you know, in point of fact, that that cellar which Mr. Graham says is worth about 7 l. or 7 guineas, paid 9 l. 2 s. late currency rent?—I heard the landlord say that it did.
9401. Who is the landlord?—Mr. Keily.
9402. And you have no doubt of the fact?—I have no doubt it did; for he told me so.
9403. So that the cellar which the landlord told you paid 9 l. 2 s. late currency rent, Mr. Graham takes on him to say is worth 7 l. or 7 guineas?—I was not in the cellar.
9404. Now I ask you, as a general question, is it the practice in Clonmel for the tenant to pay 2 l. or 3 l. more than the premises are worth?—It is not, indeed.
9405. Did you ever hear an instance of that?—I never did.

9406. Or

9406. Or of a tenant ever paying any sum beyond the value of the premises?—*Mr. Dennis Walsh*
I did not hear of any.

9407. I have read several passages from the evidence of these witnesses, and unless there be a practice such as I have now inquired about, in Clontarf, for tenants to pay 2*l.* or 3*l.* more than the premises are worth, can their evidence be true?—
That evidence is not true.

5 May 1837.

9408. Now, do you know the premises of Thomas Shaughnessy?—I do.

9409. Will you describe them?—I will. It is a large workshop. He is a cooper, and there is a room inside that; a large cellar.

9410. Does he work as a cooper there?—He does.

9411. Is that cellar lighted?—Yes; he has several men working there.

9412. Do you know what rent he pays?—I do.

9413. What is it?—£. 9.

9414. Present currency?—Yes; I have the receipt here.

[*The witness produced it.*]

9415. You are now about to produce a receipt for 9*l.* for this cellar of Thomas Shaughnessy?—Yes. And Mr. Atcheson told me that he could get more for it.

9416. Did he state how much more?—He said he could get either 10*l.* or 10 guineas; I am sure I do not recollect which it was.

9417. Is that well situated?—It is. It is convenient for the better market. It is just at the very corner, and he is a cooper.

9418. He makes casks for butter?—Yes; and it is within the space of ten yards of the better market.

9419. Then you have no doubt that if that cellar were to be let, 10*l.* at the least, so I understand you, could be got for it?—Yes; the landlord himself could get more than 10*l.* for it.

9420. Now attend to this evidence of Mr. George Graham (4853): "Do you know the premises of Thomas Shaughnessy? I do. Describe them? It is a cellar in Charleston-street, (that I suppose ought to be Johnson-street); that cellar I measured, it is 17 feet by 26 feet. What do you conceive to be its value? £. 7. 10*s.*; 8*l.* I would say; indeed 7*l.* 10*s.* would be the value of it." Now, when you have produced a receipt for 9*l.* rent for that cellar, have you any hesitation in saying that Mr. George Graham is very incorrect indeed in stating that 7*l.* 10*s.* would be the value?—Indeed, he must be very incorrect indeed. I have it from the landlord himself; and I am acquainted with his writing; that is his writing, and he admitted himself that that was the rent paid, and that he could get more for it.

9421. *Chairman.*] Have these premises been altered at all within the last few years?—No, they have not; it is just the same size as it was ever since the cellar was built, there has been no alteration.

9422. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Do you know the premises of Richard Tobin in Dublin-street?—I do.

9423. *Chairman.*] They have not been repaired three or four years ago, have they?—No.

9424. There has been no alteration whatever?—No alteration whatever that I know of.

9425. *Sir Robert Ferguson.*] What is the date of that receipt you produced?—This is the year 1833, and this the year 1837 [*producing another*].

9426. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] They are both for 9*l.*?—Yes, both for 9*l.*

9427. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Tobin occupies a cellar?—He does. It was the last sessions he was registered.

9428. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] By Mr. Howley?—Yes; and Mr. Hobson registered a man out of the same cellar, and so did Mr. Guthrie out of the same cellar.

9429. Then we have the concurrent acts of the three registering barristers in favour of the value of this cellar?—Yes.

9430. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Those three names are now on the registry, are they?—No, they have left the concern; Tobin is the last man that came in.

9431. Was Tobin opposed?—He was.

9432. Now do you know in point of fact what his rent is?—I do not exactly recollect it. I know I was by, when the landlord swore he could get ten guineas a year for it from the tenant that was registering before Mr. Hobson; 8*l.* 10*s.* is his rent.

9433. Well, you have no doubt of the value of these premises being 10*l.* a year?—I have not. The landlord could readily get ten guineas for them if he chose.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

5 May 1837.

9434. Now do you know John Smith's cellar of Lower Johnson-street?—I do not know it. I know the situation, but I did not go in.

9435. Do you know Cornelius O'Neil's?—I did; he is dead. I know the cellar. He died after the first election in Clonmel. That cellar pays ten guineas a year at this moment.

9436. Who is the tenant of it?—The widow of O'Neil.

9437. Is it a good cellar?—It is an excellent cellar.

9438. Now, I need hardly ask you, have you any doubt that that cellar is worth 10 l. a year?—I have not; I had the receipts over here with me.

9439. There is something in it, he pays ten guineas a year rent?—Yes.

9440. Now that being so, be good enough to attend to this evidence of Mr. George Graham, (No. 4847:) "Are the premises of Cornelius O'Neil of the same description? They are not; that is what we call a good cellar in that part of the town. What part of the town? It is 29, Dublin-street. What size is it? It is about 22 feet by 26. Of what value do you conceive it to be? I dare say it is worth 8 l." Now, when you know this cellar pays ten guineas a year rent, what do you say to Mr. George Graham, who says it is worth about 8 l.?—I say that I had the receipts over here with me.

9441. What do you say to Mr. George Graham's evidence; do you consider him a man of a sound judgment in these matters?—Indeed, I do not, from what you have read.

9442. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Have you been in that cellar for the purpose of valuing it?—I was in 1833.

9443. Have you been there since?—No; I cannot say that I was.

9444. Was that previous to your coming over here before?—It was. I was often in there during the election.

9445. Can you state what the value you set on it upon that occasion was, distinctly?—I have no doubt in my mind the man could get twelve guineas a year for it then; and now it is in as good a situation as any in Clonmel.

9446. You were prepared to have sustained the vote of that man when you came over upon that occasion?—I was, and every person that came over with me.

9447. So that you examined the premises with a view to sustain his vote?—I did.

9448. And your valuation of course is made under that impression?—Yes, it was; I had Mr. Holmes' receipt.

9449. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Who is Mr. Holmes?—The landlord.

9450. You had that in 1833?—I had; and two or three days before I came here, I asked him whether it was O'Neil's widow that was in the cellar, and he said it was.

9451. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Your statement of the value now is founded on your impression then?—It is; and I have it from the landlord, that if O'Neil's widow left it, he could get 12 l. or twelve guineas a year for it.

9452. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] You knew the premises well in 1833?—I did.

9453. If they were of the value you now describe in 1833, have you any doubt they were of that value when they were registered in 1831?—I have not.

9454. Well, knowing that the premises paid ten guineas a year rent at present. I presume you considered it unnecessary to visit them, or to examine them previously to your coming here?—I did not think they would be disputed at all, and particularly when the man was dead.

9455. And I presume then you were very much surprised to find Mr. George Graham represented them as worth only 8 l.—Indeed, I am.

9456. Mr. *Hamilton*.] I presume you can state how that cellar was lighted?—I can.

9457. Describe it?—As well as I recollect; I do not know whether there were either one or two windows at the back part of it; I have no doubt there was one, but I have my doubts about the second; and there was one in the front, as well as I can recollect. I think there were four apartments in that cellar.

9458. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Now, do you know the premises of Thomas Mackey, stone-mason, in White's-lane?—Yes, I do.

9459. You do not undertake to say they are worth 10 l.?—No, I would not.

9460. Well, Michael Tobins, do you sustain that?—He has left it. Those houses are all thrown down.

9461. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Were his premises worth 10 l. when he occupied them; Tobins'?—I would not take on me to say they were. I have not a recollection.

9462. *Janes*

5 May 1837.

9462. James Fitzgerald in Gravel-walk, he is dead too?—Yes.
9465. John Head, St. Stephen's-lane?—John Hall that must be.
9464. Well, he has left I believe, too?—Yes.
9465. Mr. *Hamilton*.] What do you value his premises at?—I would not take on me to say they are worth 10 l.
9466. Several of the persons whose names have been mentioned are dead and gone?—Yes; but there are several people in cellars in other parts of the town who are living, that I would not say their premises were worth 10 l.
9467. Mr. *Lefroy*.] And who were registered?—They were.
9468. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] I believe that last one, James Fitzgerald, was one of Mr. Bagwell's men?—He was.
9469. He voted for Mr. Bagwell?—Yes, and a great many others that you mentioned too.
9470. Michael Conuor, he is gone I believe too?—He is.
9471. Andrew Armstrong, he is gone?—Yes.
9472. And he voted for Mr. Bagwell?—He did.
9473. And you cannot say much to the premises occupied by either of those?—No.
9474. Patrick Callaghan?—Yes, he is gone; and I would not say they are worth 10 l. a year.
9475. So that I think I have enumerated a good many instances of persons whose premises you cannot say are worth 10 l. a year, who have either left the town or are dead?—Yes.
9476. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Those persons you mean voted, most of them, when they were residing or alive?—They did at the first election.
9477. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Edward Mackin?—He has left too; he lived in a similar house to Armstrong, I would not say that the house was worth 10 l. a year.
9478. Now, do you know the premises of Richard O'Meagher, in Morton-street?—He is dead too; but I know his premises.
9479. Do you know them well?—Indeed I do.
9480. And the value of them?—I had his receipts over here in 1833. He is dead, and I did not examine them when I was coming over now, the man being dead.
9481. But you can state then what his rent was?—As well as I recollect it was 9 l. 2 s. late currency.
9482. Who do they belong to?—They belong to Mr. Morgan Jones.
9483. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Is he one of the persecuting landlords?—No, I never knew Mr. Jones to persecute his tenants.
9484. Now, knowing that the rent was 9 l. 2 s., and knowing the premises, have you any hesitation in saying that they were of the value of 10 l. a year?—I have not. Mr. Jones, according as they become vacant, as the tenant leaves them, takes them into his own hands, and they pay him, I suppose, much more than 12 l. a year now.
9485. Then this is one of the class of houses of the character you mentioned?—Yes.
9486. So, that although it was only let for 9 l. 2 s. when taken up by Mr. Jones, the landlord, he gets 12 l. a year now, you say?—He sets them now to lodgers, weekly and monthly lodgers, and makes over 12 l. a year. He has taken them into his own hands; he finds them more profitable than to let them to persons.
9487. Now will you attend to the evidence of Mr. Richard Legge, (No. 4278): "Are you acquainted with the house of Richard O'Meagher, of Morton-street? Yes. Can you state the rent of that house? £. 8 is the rent of that house, and I consider it the value, but no more. How do you know it is 8 l.? I had it from the landlord. Who is the landlord? Morgan Jones. Where is he? He is in Clonmel, I believe. What is he by trade? He carries on the bakery business. Who did he vote for at the election? Mr. Bagwell. And he told you the rent was 8 l.? Yes. Now, were you ever in the house? I was. When? I have been frequently in it; I was in it in 1833. Do you mean to say you were all over it? I cannot say I was, but I have been in other houses of the same description, five or six. Were you ever in more than one apartment of that house? I think it is very likely I was; I have been in most of those houses. But you cannot say you were? No, I cannot positively, in that house, not upstairs, but I was upstairs in the next house, which is the same size. Your judgment is that it is worth 8 l. only? Yes. Now let me ask you this; suppose that one or more persons of competent

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

8 May 1857.

Judgment were to value that house at 10 *l.*, two or three persons, would you be inclined to distrust your own judgment, persons who know as much about value as you? No, I would not. You would still persist? I would." Now you hear that it was stated by Mr. Richard Legge, that he knew from the landlord, Morgan Jones, that the rent was 8 *l.* Now I think you have told me you had the receipt, and that you knew from the landlord, Morgan Jones, it was 9 *l.* 2 *s.*?—I have the landlord's receipt. I did not know from Morgan Jones, I knew from the tenant; as well as I recollect it was 9 *l.* 2 *s.* a year.

9488. Have you any doubt about it?—I did not go now to inquire, but I recollect that we were all prepared to sustain that man's vote.

9489. Is it your impression that the rent was 9 *l.* 2 *s.*?—It is.

9490. Then, that being the case, do you agree in this valuation of Mr. Richard Legge's, "that 8 *l.* I considered the value, but no more?"—I do not.

9491. And you have no hesitation in saying you consider that they are of the value of 10 *l.* a year?—No; the landlord has taken those houses into his own possession, and set them to weekly and monthly tenants.

9492. And he is making, you say, 12 *l.* a year of them?—I should suppose about that. He makes more by the week than setting them by the year.

9493. Do you know Michael Lacy's, in New-street?—I do.

9494. Do you know anything of those premises?—I would not say they are worth 10 *l.* a year; he is living there yet.

9495. Do you know Thomas Sheehy's, in Blind-street?—I did not go to examine that.

9496. Do you know James Smith's, of Richmond-street?—I do.

9497. Well, do you consider that of the value of 10 *l.*?—I do.

9498. Have you any doubt about that?—I have not; that man was registered by Mr. Howley, and he sent two competent persons out of court to inspect it before he admitted the man; they came back and they swore to the value, and he admitted him then. He sent two tradesmen.

9499. Then his registry was opposed?—It was; two persons were sent out of court to value it, and they came back and swore to the value of it, and he was admitted.

9500. Now, do you know the premises of Michael Skiffington, Stumbles-lane?—Yes; I was not through them; I know the situation of them. That man has always voted for Mr. Bagwell. I heard the rent that he pays. From every appearance outside of the house and the shop, (I was as far as the shop, out up stairs,) I think they are very well worth 10 *l.* a year.

9501. But you do not think you are competent to speak of it as correctly as other premises, because you did not go to?—No.

9502. Do you know Dennis Slattery's, Johnson-street?—No; Slattery, I believe, has left it.

9503. Do you know Richard Butler's premises?—I do; I would not say they are worth 10 *l.* a year.

9504. Do you know William Davis's, New-street?—I do.

9505. I believe he is removed?—No; he is not.

9506. Do you know his premises?—I do; I would not say they are worth 10 *l.* a year.

9507. Patrick Dumphy, Mary-street?—I did not examine that.

9508. Do you know Timothy Toole, and Patrick Rosch, I think it is Dispensary-street?—You examined me about them the first day.

9509. Did I examine you as to the value of them the first day?—You did.

9510. Stephen Mara, Blind-street; do you know him?—I do.

9511. Do you know his premises?—I do.

9512. Will you describe them?—A thatched house with half an acre of ground and six perches, upon which there is wheat growing; and he has two houses on the premises, on part of the ground, which pay him, I think, fifty shillings a year each.

9513. That is to say, he lets them for that?—Yes.

9514. Do you know what his rent is?—I do not. The new Asylum was built on part of his ground. I know he got a reduction from his landlord; in consequence of giving up some of his ground he got a reduction in the rent.

9515. Now, have you any hesitation in putting the value of 10 *l.* upon those premises?—I have not.

9516. Do you consider if they were to be let to-morrow that 10 *l.* could be got for them?—I do; there is over half an acre of ground.

9517. What

9517. What is that worth?—The ground about Clonmel sets at from 12 guineas to 16 *l.* an acre.
9518. Do you consider this half acre of ground, supposing there were no buildings upon it, would let for from 12 guineas to 16 *l.* an acre?—I have no doubt of it; not the least.
9519. Then, if that be so, the buildings on it make it more valuable?—It does. There are two houses built on it besides the one he resides in.
9520. Then just attend to this evidence of William Smith, (No. 3473): "Do you know the house of Stephen Mara of Blind-street? Yes; that is a thatched house with about a quarter of an acre of ground attached to it, on which he has grown some wheat." Is that true, that the ground attached to Stephen Mara's house is only a quarter of an acre?—It is not.
9521. You stated, I think, there is half an acre and some perches?—And six perches.
9522. Again, attend to this, if you please: "What value do you set on it? I think it is worth 6 *l.*, allowing 2 *l.* 10 *s.* for the quarter of an acre of ground, and 3 *l.* 10 *s.* for his thatched house. I think 6 *l.* the extreme value of it." Now you observed the extreme accuracy of that answer; putting together the 2 *l.* 10 *s.* allowed for the quarter of an acre of ground, and the 3 *l.* 10 *s.* for the thatched house, the result is, they are worth just 6 *l.*; now, do you concur in that statement?—I do not; there are two houses built on it, and half an acre and six perches of ground.
9523. Then your statement is, that the ground alone without the houses——?—Would set at from 12 guineas to 16 *l.* an acre.
9524. That is to say, would set for 6 *l.* or 7 *l.*?—Yes; to throw the two houses out entirely, that it would; for the ground would fetch 10 *l.* a year.
9525. *Chairman.*] That is your opinion?—It is; I know he paid more rent than he does at present.
9526. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] He has given up some part?—Yes.
9527. And there has been some reduction in the rent of course?—Yes; he had more ground when he registered in 1832.
9528. Then do I understand you to say, at the time when he registered in 1832, that at that time he had more than half an acre and six perches?—He had; for the new Penitentiary is built since.
9529. Then of course his premises must have been worth more at that time than they are now?—They were; and he has got a reduction in his rent for giving up the ground for the Penitentiary.
9530. Do you know the premises of Patrick Burke of Dispensary-street?—You before examined me about that.
9531. Do you know William Carew's, of Dispensary-street?—Yes; that is the same. He is dead.
9532. Do you mean the same house?—In the same street.
9533. Do you mean to say the evidence you gave in relation to Patrick Burke's house is applicable to William Carew's?—It is; they are all the very same, there is no difference at all.
9534. Then you have no doubt William Carew's is well worth 10 *l.* a year?—I have not. Mr. Hobson, who was very particular, admitted them and Napper too.
9535. Now turn to the valuation, and tell me what that house of William Carew's is valued at?—£. 6.
9536. Do you know the rent that William Carew pays?—£. 8, late currency; and here is the receipt [*producing it*].
9537. That was the rent?—Yes.
9538. And that accurate book of the commissioners values the house at 6 *l.*, which pays 8 *l.* rent, is it not so?—It is.
9539. Do you consider that another instance of the inaccuracy of that valuation?—I do.
9540. Turn to that, and see whether Patrick Burke's is not also valued at 6 *l.* They are all valued at 6 *l.*, and they all pay 8 *l.* rent?—Yes.
9541. *Chairman.*] And they are all on the registry?—They are; two of them have left.
9542. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] But they are all registered?—Yes; Mr. Hobson registered one of them.
9543. Which was that?—Napper's.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

5 May 1837.

9544. Then do you find there Patrick Burke's valued at 6*l*?—Yes; every one of them.
9545. When you say every one, how many are there?—Michael Russell, William Carew, Patrick Roach. I do not see Burke here.
9546. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Perhaps it is in some other person's name?—The commissioners have valued Toole's house the same as they did Carew's and Russell's.
9547. That is, all 6*l*?—Yes; Mr. Smith, you stated, or at least he said, that Toole's was worth 10*l*; that he admitted it.
9548. £.6. is the valuation of all those houses in the commissioners' book?—Yes.
9549. And you know they all pay 8*l* rent?—They do; there is the receipt.
9550. Mr. Hamilton.] Roach and Toole live in the same house?—Toole has left it.
9551. But they were registered both living at the same house?—They were. Roach never voted at either of the elections.
9552. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you know Thomas Hogan's premises in the Main-street?—I do.
9553. It is a cellar?—I would not say the cellar was worth 10*l* a year.
9554. Do you mean to say you know nothing about it?—I do. I would not say the cellar was worth 10*l* a year.
9555. Chairman.] Is he registered?—He is.
9556. Mr. Lefroy.] Who registered him, do you remember?—Mr. Guthrie.
9557. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Michael Keif's, in the Main-street; do you know that?—I do.
9558. Well, you do not say much for that either?—No.
9559. Mr. Lefroy.] You would not say that was worth 10*l* a year?—No; I do not think it is worth 10*l*.
9560. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you know Anthony Mingan?—I do.
9561. Do you know his cellar?—I do.
9562. Describe the cellar?—It is a large cellar, and there is a room inside it.
9563. Is that in a good situation?—It is only three or four or five doors from my place.
9564. Has he been long in possession?—He has, some years.
9565. Has he a shop in the cellar?—He has.
9566. Do you know the rent he pays?—I do not exactly know the rent; I think something about 8*l*, or 8*l* 10*s*.; I am not positive.
9567. Do you know the dimensions of the cellar?—I do.
9568. State them?—I should suppose about twelve feet in breadth.
9569. What depth?—I dare say about thirty, room and all.
9570. Now, have you any hesitation in saying that that cellar is worth 10*l* a year?—I have not; it is a larger cellar than mine.
9571. You have already told us, you refused 9*l* a year and a year's rent in kind for yours?—I did.
9572. And you have no doubt it is a more valuable cellar than yours?—No; it is a larger cellar.
9573. And more valuable?—And more valuable.
9574. Now that being so, will you attend to this evidence, (No. 4813:) "Now, as to the holding of Anthony Mingan, is that also a cellar? That is also a cellar; it is a cellar only about eight feet wide to the street." Do you agree with that statement, that it is only eight feet wide to the street?—I do not, there are very few cellars in Clonsmel confined to eight feet wide.
9575. And this you describe as a large cellar?—Yes.
9576. And what do you state to be the width?—It is at least 12 feet.
9577. Then the examination proceeds: "And how much in depth? It may be about 20 feet, or 21 or 24 feet." Do you admit that?—I do not.
9578. You state it to be 30?—I do.
9579. It is stated to be lighted by the entrance only, is that so?—Yes.
9580. The next question is: "What do you conceive to be its value? Perhaps from 5*l*. to 6*l*.; 6*l*. I will say is the extreme value. The situation is very good or I would not value it at that; the width is only 8 feet or thereabouts." Now you have stated the rent to be 8*l* or 8*l* 10*s*.; have you any hesitation in saying that Mr. George Graham is exceedingly incorrect, when he states the extreme value to be only 6*l*?—He makes a very serious mistake. I have it from the landlady. I am not sure whether it is 8*l*. or 8*l* 10*s*.

9581. Now

5 May 1837.

9581. Now attend to the next question: "Have you been in Mingan's premises for the purpose of valuing? Not directly for the purpose of valuation, but I have been down it as being an inspector of weights and measures; I have gone down it, and did make observations upon it." Can you account for that answer; that Mr. George Graham's mistakes, respecting the locality and the value of this cellar, must have arisen from his attention being fixed on the weights and measures, and not on the cellar itself? Can you account for it in that way?—I do not know what it was that induced Mr. Graham to state those kind of things.

9582. Now, do you know John and Edward Durney, in Mary-street?—I do.

9583. Were you present at the registry?—I do not recollect that I was present at the registry.

9584. Then you cannot state what passed?—No, I cannot.

9585. Do you know John Meagher's, in New-street?—I do.

9586. I believe you cannot say much for those premises?—I cannot.

9587. You cannot say they are of the value of 10*l*?—No; I cannot.

9588. I believe he is one of Mr. Bagwell's; is he not?—He is; and a good many of those you mentioned.

9589. He voted for Mr. Bagwell?—He did.

9590. His vote was not objected to by Mr. Bagwell's people, was it?—It was not.

9591. Do you know Michael Morrice of Main-street?—I do not.

9592. Do you know Thomas O'Connor of Main-street; a cellar?—I do.

9593. Can you state anything as to that?—I could not say it is worth 10*l* a year, though I believe he pays 7*l* 10*s*. for it, because the cellar is not so good as other cellars in the neighbourhood; it is a small cellar.

9594. *Chairman.*] Which way did he vote?—He voted for Mr. Ronayne on both occasions.

9595. *Mr. Sergeant Ball.*] John Hackett and Dominick Ronayne, Main street; were you present at the registry of Mr. Ronayne before Mr. Howley?—I was not.

9596. Do you know Michael Tobin's premises of Kilsheelan-street?—He has left. All those places are thrown down.

9597. Do you know James Burke and the Rev. Sackville Burke of Johnson-street?—I do.

9598. Were you present at the registry?—I was.

9599. I believe Sackville Burke has left?—The Rev. Mr. Burke has left.

9600. Now you were present at the registry?—I was.

9601. Do you know, from what passed, out of what portion of the premises Sackville Burke registered?—Out of the stable.

9602. They were registered by Mr. Guthrie?—They were.

9603. And did Sackville Burke state he had the exclusive use or right to the stable?—He did.

9604. Did he swear to the value of it?—He swore it was of the value to him of 10*l*, and Mr. Burke corroborated him, his landlord.

9605. As to the value?—Yes; that he had the exclusive right to the stable, as well as I recollect.

9606. And they were admitted accordingly?—They were both.

9607. Do you know John and Thomas Graham, of Duncan-street?—I do.

9608. I believe John Graham has left?—He has; but his brother left the premises before, and he came back and voted out of it several months after. They were registered by Mr. Guthrie before the late election; he left the town several months before that, and came back and voted at the last election.

9609. Who did?—Thomas did.

9609*. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Although he had left the premises?—Yes.

9610. He was not the occupier at the time of the election?—His brother was; he was not.

9611. *Chairman.*] He voted for Mr. Bagwell?—He did. He was living down in the Queen's County.

9612. His name is on the registry?—Yes.

9613. *Mr. Hamilton.*] So that he may do the same again if there is another election?—Yes; and I am quite sure he will. There were persons living in Liverpool, who came over from Liverpool at the last election and voted for Mr. Bagwell.

9614. And they may do that with perfect impunity and success?—And another from

Mr. Dennis Walsh.
4 May 1837.

from Castle Bellingham came up and voted for Mr. Bagwell; but Graham is a householder, and he came over and voted at the last election.

9615. *Chairman.*] And nobody for Mr. Ronayne in that way?—No; there was no one outside the borough voted for him. There was in Clonmel.

9616. *Sir Robert Ferguson.*] Do you mean to say none went out of the premises they had left, and voted for Mr. Ronayne?—Yes, there was a man named Quinlan, that left the house, that went back and voted; that was the only instance. He was out of it for some time.

9617. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] John and Thomas Graham, do you know what their premises are worth?—They are worth 50 *l.* or 60 *l.* a year.

9618. But there is only one vote left now?—Yes, there are two; he will come back again.

9619. And you have no redress; you cannot prevent him from voting?—No.

9620. Well, Walter and William Keating, what do you say to them?—I think they were registered as joint-tenants; I should suppose they were.

9621. Were you present?—I was not.

9622. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Do you know anything about the value of those men's premises?—I consider them worth 50 *l.* or 60 *l.* a year.

9623. Do you know Patrick Welch and William Pollard, William-street?—They have two houses.

9624. Do you know the premises?—I do.

9625. What do you say to them?—They have two houses, and both voted out of the same house, they voted as joint-tenants; there are two houses, one is the rear, and another in front.

9626. I believe Pollard has left?—Yes, he has; Welch's father built the concern.

9627. Well, do you take the premises occupied by Welch to be worth 10 *l.* a year?—They are worth 15 *l.* or 16 *l.* a year.

9628. You have no doubt of that?—No.

9629. William Purcell, Gordon-street?—He has left too.

9630. Do you know John Hayes, in Warren-street?—I do.

9631. Do you know his premises?—I would not say they are worth 10 *l.* a year.

9632. Do you know Messrs. Going of Irishtown?—Yes, I do.

9633. Did you know the premises of William Gorman, in Bagwell-street?—I did.

9634. I believe he was a smith, was he not?—He was; he has left the place.

9635. Well, he registered out of a house and forge, I believe?—Yes.

9636. I believe the Bank of Ireland is now built on the site of his premises?—It is.

9637. Now, do you happen to know what rent William Gorman paid for his premises before they were taken down?—£. 13 or 14 *l.*; he gave me his receipts.

9638. Have you got the receipts there?—Yes, I have; here they are [*producing them*].

9639. When you say 13 *l.* or 14 *l.*, do you mean 13 *l.* sometimes and 14 *l.* others?—No; I will show you the receipts; 6 guineas a half year, 13 guineas a year.

9640. When was that receipt given?—In the year 1827.

9641. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Was that for the forge?—It was a house; there was a large forge and yard; I know we were prepared to defend it; we had several of his receipts at one time; he paid, I believe latterly, 6 *l.* for the half year, but he was paying 13 guineas a year.

9642. When you say latterly, do you mean at the time of his registry in 1832?—As well as I recollect, I am not quite sure about it; I thought I had more of his receipts; I find I have but four.

9643. But have you any doubt his rent was at least 10 *l.* at the time of his registry?—I have no doubt he was paying 10 *l.* at the time he registered, because we were all prepared to support it.

9644. His premises, I believe, were extensive?—They were certainly in a bad way; it was an old ruin; they were large; there was a good deal of room.

9645. That room was of use to him in his trade?—It was; he was a coach-smith; and I heard it said, for giving up the house to the landlord or landlady, he got something for his goodwill.

9646. *Sir Robert Ferguson.*] Ready money or arrears?—Ready money.

9647. *Mr.*

9647. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] That he was paid some money for giving up possession?—Yes; for they were sold to the Bank of Ireland.

9648. Now, that being the case, will you attend to this evidence of Joseph Higgins (2833): "Do you recollect the case of William Gorman? I do, a smith; he had a little forge in a little shed; that is down now, and the man is gone. The new Bank of Ireland is erected where that little place stood; he was registered out of a place that was valued in the commissioners' book at 5*l.*" Now do you agree in that description of the premises, a little forge, in a little shed, and the new Bank of Ireland is erected where that little place stood? I think you described the premises to me as being spacious?—Of course it was, where the Bank of Ireland was built it could not have been a small place.

9649. You do not call that a small place?—No.

9650. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Do you mean the bank occupies only the premises that William Gorman occupied?—No; there was more ground than what Gorman held.

9651. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] But you described the premises of Gorman as being extensive?—Yes.

9652. Now look to the return then, and see what is the valuation of these premises in the book; William Gorman's premises?—*£. 5.*

9653. Now those premises which are described by Joseph Higgins as a paltry little forge, and a little shed, and a little place, and which the commissioners have valued at 5*l.*, actually paid thirteen guineas Irish rent at the time that you mention?—It did; I have receipts here.

9654. Now do you see another instance there of the extreme inaccuracy of that valuation?—I do.

9655. And also of the inaccuracy of Mr. Joseph Higgins in his valuation?—I do.

9656. Now have you any doubt, after what you have stated and what you have heard, that those premises are worth 10*l.* a year?—I have not the least.

9657. They actually paid 10*l.* rent?—They paid more.

9658. *Chairman*.] Which way did William Gorman vote?—He voted but once, and that was for Mr. Ronayne. He left afterwards.

9659. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Now do you know whether that forge was thatched or slated?—It was slated.

9660. You are quite sure it was slated?—I have no doubt about it.

9661. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Do you know Hannah Keefe?—She was the landlady.

9662. Of these premises upon which the Bank of Ireland now in part stands?—Yes; and I think her son or son-in-law, Mr. Dunn; I think they were both joined.

9663. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Then, having told me that that was slated, attend to this question in the evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins, (3048): "Will you mention the names of those that are thatched? There is Keily's in Gravel-walk; Nicholas Lynch, Gravel-walk; Daniel English, Upper Johnson-street; Thomas Walsh, New-street; Thomas Sheehy, Blind-street; William Gorman, Bagwell-street; but that is down long ago, and the Bank of Ireland erected there." Now is it the fact, that William Gorman's premises in Bagwell-street were thatched?—It is not.

9664. Then that appears to you another instance of Mr. Joseph Higgins's inaccuracy?—It does.

9665. Sir *Robert Ferguson*.] Do you remember the year they were pulled down?—I suppose two or three years ago. I think three years ago or something more.

9666. *Chairman*.] Why are you so sure that this was not a thatched house?—Because I was frequently in it.

9667. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Do you know the premises of John Conway in Irish-town?—I do.

9668. Be so good as turn to the valuation, and tell me what they are valued at?—I do not find it.

9669. Do you find Ellen Conway?—No, I do not.

9670. Now, were you present at the registry by Mr. Guthrie?—I was.

9671. Were you present during the entire, or the greater part of the time, or what portion of the time?—I was not present during the entire, I was in and out.

0.30.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

5 May 1837.

9672. Had you an opportunity of observing on what principle Mr. Guthrie proceeded in admitting claimants to register, or rejecting them?—I had.

9673. Now, from what you observed, can you say whether it was Mr. Guthrie's practice to admit claimants to register, upon their swearing that the premises were worth 10 l. to them, in opposition to evidence given to prove that they were not worth 10 l.?—I saw him reject a great many who were opposed, when witnesses were produced.

9674. Mr. Hamilton.] State a few of those.—

9674.* Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you remember a person of the name of James O'Brien, tailor?—I do.

9675. You remember his coming up to register?—Yes.

9676. Was he admitted or rejected?—Rejected.

9677. Was that upon the evidence of any one or more persons?—I stated yesterday about this man. When he came up to be registered, Mr. Welch, the court, who was conducting the case for Mr. Bagwell said, "Your worship, it is too bad to be admitting this man to his franchise; he is not entitled to it." Mr. Guthrie turned round and said, "What am I to do? here is a man who has sworn, and you will not produce any witnesses; this man has sworn it is worth 10 l. to him; do you produce witnesses, and then I will decide;" or words to that effect. And Mr. Guthrie asked the man, "If you got 10 l. for it, would you leave to-morrow?" He said "I would," and he immediately rejected him.

9678. That is, upon the claimant, James O'Brien, admitting he would give up the premises if he got 10 l. a year for them, he rejected him, considering it was not of the value of 10 l.?—Yes.

9679. Mr. Hamilton.] So that that man admitted it was not worth 10 l. a year to him?—He did; at least he swore it was worth 10 l. a year, and Mr. Guthrie then examined him, and asked him would he leave the premises if he got 10 l. a year, and he said he would, and he rejected him.

9680. Does not it appear to you, that that was an acknowledgment, in point of fact, that they were not worth 10 l. a year to him?—Yes, it was.

9681. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then Mr. Guthrie, the registering barrister, in order to test the statement made by the man, that they were worth 10 l. a year to him, put the question to him, "Would you leave them if you got 10 l. a year for them?" he scrutinized the statement that they were worth 10 l. to him accurately, and, as it appears, successfully, and he got from the claimant what amounted in substance to this, that they were not worth 10 l. a year to him?—Yes; and he rejected him accordingly. There were two persons living next door to him, and they came up, and swore they would not leave the premises for 10 l., and he admitted them.

9682. Mr. Hamilton.] So, that where the barrister was satisfied the men swore truly in stating the premises were worth 10 l. a year to him, he admitted him, and where he was satisfied the man did not swear truly, he rejected him?—He did; and he asked Lynch and Keily would they leave the premises if they got 10 l. a year, and both of them stated they would not.

9683. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you mean to say, that whenever a claimant satisfied the barrister that the premises were worth 10 l. a year to him, that the barrister admitted him to register, even against evidence to the contrary?—I do not.

9684. Then, where it appeared by contrary evidence that the premises were not worth 10 l. a year, the course was for the barrister to reject him?—He rejected a great many.

9685. Now I want you to specify them; I asked you whether James O'Brien, a tailor, was not rejected; you tell me he was?—Yes.

9686. And you stated the circumstance, namely, that he began by stating the premises were worth 10 l. a year to him, and then the barrister examined him by asking what he meant by that, and in the result he satisfied himself the statement was untrue?—He did.

9687. Were there witnesses examined in that case?—No.

9688. Mr. Hamilton.] Can you state the day, or the time of the registry that had took place?—No; I could not state that. It was in the letter "O."

9689. Mr. Lefroy.] How was it possible to meet that sort of swearing; where a man swore that the premises were worth to him so much, how could any person come

5 May 1837.

come up and contradict the man by counter-evidence, and say they were not worth to him so much?—There were several came up.

9690. And what was the nature of the counter-evidence?—I was just going to state a case. There was a man named Jeremiah Cronan, he came forward and swore that the place to him was worth 10*l.* a year; Mr. Bagwell's agent, Mr. Douglas, swore the reverse of that, and he was rejected.

9691. Tell me what did Mr. Bagwell's agent swear, what you call the reverse of that?—He swore the premises were not worth 10*l.* a year, or any such money.

9692. Did he swear they were not worth to that man 10*l.* a year?—He swore they were not worth 10*l.* a year, as well as I recollect, and the man was rejected.

9693. Well then, it appears that the criterion that the barrister established for the registry was one which necessarily led in many, and must have led in many instances to a registering at an under value?—There were of course some persons registered under value; but, however, the barrister was always —

9694. Was not the form of the question he put always, whether it was worth to the claimant 10*l.*?—As well as I recollect, when the persons came up to register, he used to ask, "What is your name; what are your premises worth; is it of the clear yearly value of 10*l.* to you? It is." That was it.

9695. Then upon the man's swearing it was worth to him that clear yearly value, he was registered?—He was.

9696. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] He was registered, unless on further examination of him before the barrister, the barrister satisfied himself that his first statement was incorrect?—Yes.

9697. Or unless evidence was called to prove the contrary?—Unless evidence was called to prove the contrary, he admitted the man; for I often heard him say he would take a man's oath in preference to the assertion of any man without being sworn.

9698. Mr. Hamilton.] A man swearing that his premises are worth 10*l.* a year to him, is swearing in a matter of opinion?—I should suppose so.

9699. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do not you call that a matter of knowledge, must not the man know what the premises are worth to him?—I think a great many persons that did swear, the reason for making use of that expression was, they did not know what their premises would let for; even to this very day, before the present barrister, they say they are worth to me 10*l.*, men that are actually paying 12*l.* and 13*l.*

9700. Mr. Lefroy.] Do not you think they include in that the convenience and the accommodation to them, quite independent of the intrinsic value of the premises?—I do not know; some of them may, but I would not take on myself to say that they do not include it, some might.

9701. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But your impression is, as I collect from you, that what they mean, at least some of these persons, when they speak to the premises being worth 10*l.* to them, is this: that not having had an opportunity of letting or ascertaining what they would fetch in the market, they hesitate to say distinctly what the premises are worth in the abstract?—Precisely so; that is what I mean.

9702. And it is a saving to their conscience, I suppose, to be able to say what they know, namely, what they are worth to them?—Yes; that class of people, whenever they go up to register, always say they are worth to me 10*l.* a year.

9703. And persons paying 12*l.* and 13*l.* a year rent say the very same?—Yes; persons paying 12*l.* and 13*l.* rent say the very same.

9704. Mr. Hamilton.] Does it not occur to you, that premises of very inconsiderable value indeed, perhaps not worth 5*l.* a year, may be thought by an individual, on account of some particular circumstance, worth 10*l.* or more to him?—I know there are persons registered who would not say their concerns were worth 10*l.* a year, and yet would not leave them for 10*l.*, swearing it.

9705. Then that practice of swearing the premises are worth so much to the particular individual creates a loose habit of swearing, I presume?—I would not like to swear it.

9706. There are some who have sworn their premises are worth 10*l.* a year to them, with regard to whom, you think, the premises are not worth 10*l.*?—There are; and I know that several of those persons to-morrow would not leave their concerns for 10*l.* a year, that do not pay any such rent, and they I have no hesitation in saying are not worth 10*l.* a year.

9707. So that they have sworn to that which is to them, conscientiously, swearing to it on oath?—I would not swear it.

9708. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You have been asked whether that habit of the claimants

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

5 May 1837.

claimants swearing their premises are worth 10 *l.* a year to them; that qualification of the general statement, did not, in your opinion, lead to the registry of persons whose premises were not of the due value of 10 *l.*?—Yes.

9709. And you have answered you thought it did in some instances?—Yes.

9710. Now, you will recollect I have asked you, and you have gone through a series of premises with respect to which I have examined you as to the value; you have told me in some instances, I believe in several instances, you would not take on yourself to say the premises were of the value of 10 *l.*; do you recollect that in nearly all those instances the persons who had registered out of premises you did not consider of the value of 10 *l.* are either dead, or have left the premises?—The greater part of them.

9711. Now is it your impression from your general,—(and you seem to have a very comprehensive knowledge of the state of the representation here),—is it your impression that there now remains in Clonmel any considerable number of persons whose premises are not of the value of 10 *l.*?—That were on the registry?

9712. No; I do not mean appearing on the registry, but competent to vote, who have neither died or removed?—I think there are at present, as near as I can calculate, on the registry (I do not include freemen now,) but I think there are about from 20 to 23 persons voters who ought not to be voters. I think there are about that.

9713. That is to say, you exclude all persons appearing on the registry who have either died or removed?—Yes; I think there are from 20 to 23 yet, that ought not to be on the registry, that are not entitled, that are I think under value.

9714. Mr. *Lefroy.*] Householders?—Yes; I believe about that number.

9715. And I believe, from an answer you gave on a former occasion, some voted for Mr. Bagwell, and some for Mr. Ronayne?—I am not sure whether 9 or 11 persons; I mentioned, I think, 11 that voted for Mr. Bagwell.

9716. Then there are about half and half?—There are more that voted for Mr. Ronayne than Mr. Bagwell; some two, or three, or four. I am quite satisfied not one more than that.

9717. So that upon the balance of bad votes your impression is that Mr. Ronayne has about four in his favour?—Yes, I think so.

9718. *Chairman.*] In that calculation I suppose, of course, you exclude all those who (whatever rent they pay) have still houses that you value at 10 *l.* and upwards?—I do.

9719. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Do you know the total number of householders?—I do not.

9720. Mr. *Lefroy.*] So that on the most liberal calculation, and I suppose you reckon your own such, there are 23 bad votes of householders?—I think there are about 23.

9721. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] But are you aware others differ from you, and conceive your judgment is not as liberal in this matter as theirs is?—I think there are persons that will be examined here that will endeavour to sustain seven or eight votes that I would not.

9722. So that you are rather, if I may be allowed the term, you are rather a purist in these matters?—There was a very respectable architect accompanied me when I was going about.

9723. What is his name?—Mr. Thornton; and when the other architect was not brought over here, the people in Clonmel said they would not send forward the person they appointed.

9724. What was the other architect's name?—Mr. Tinsley.

9725. I believe he was summoned, and was unable to attend from illness?—Yes; he had got a fever.

9726. And it was in consequence of the conservative architect not coming forward that the liberal people did not choose to send theirs?—Yes; there is not a man that I stated I can support that Mr. Thornton would not have supported if he were here; and there is not a more respectable man in his rank in Clonmel than Mr. Thornton.

9727. Mr. *Lefroy.*] Then Mr. Thornton would concur with you, that there were those twenty-three bad votes?—He would.

9728. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] Now you stated the balance of bad votes to be about four in favour of Mr. Ronayne?—Yes.

9729. As far as householders go, according to your recollection?—Yes.

9730. Now if you were to consider the freemen, can you form any estimate of which

which side the balance of bad votes would be if you were to take into account the objection against the freemen. I believe all the freemen, without exception, voted for Mr. Bagwell?—Every man but one would vote for Mr. Bagwell, Mr. Stephen Lonergan.

9731. But you objected to him as a bad freeman also?—We did.

9732. With the exception of Stephen Lonergan, all the freemen who registered voted for Mr. Bagwell?—Every one.

9733. And, accordingly, if the objectionable freemen's votes are taken into account, the balance of bad votes will turn then greatly in favour of Mr. Bagwell, that is to say, he has a very considerable balance of bad votes?—He has.

9734. What is the number of registered freemen, do you know?—I do not know; but upwards of 100 I should say.

9735. If all the freemen go, I believe that the minority will be very considerable?—Yes.

9736. Do you recollect the case of John Casey, schoolmaster?—Yes.

9737. Was he rejected?—He was.

9738. Was there any evidence?—As well as I recollect he paid 8 *l.* rent, and his landlord, Mr. Burke, came up and swore it was not worth 10 *l.*, and he was rejected.

9739. Mr. Burke is the gentleman we have been speaking of before?—Yes; Mr. James Burke.

9740. And did Casey state it was worth 10 *l.* to him?—He did.

9741. And then Casey's landlord, who was competent to speak to the value of the premises, from his knowledge of them, having stated that in his judgment they were not worth 10 *l.*, the barrister rejected Casey, although Casey stated they were worth 10 *l.*?—He did.

9742. Do you remember Edward Ronay, saddler?—I do.

9743. Was he rejected?—He was.

9744. Were there witnesses examined there?—I do not exactly recollect; I think Mara was examined.

9745. Do you remember whether Mara was examined?—I am not sure, but there was counter-evidence produced, and the barrister rejected him.

9746. Witnesses were examined on both sides?—Yes.

9747. Did Ronay state the premises were worth 10 *l.* a year?—Yes.

9748. And yet he was rejected?—Yes.

9749. Do you remember George Blackwell, tailor?—I do.

9750. Was he rejected?—He was.

9751. Do you remember on whose evidence?—I do not; but I know there was a witness examined.

9752. Do you remember whether it was Mr. James Burke or Mr. Atcheson?—It was one of them; I think either Burke or Atcheson; I may be wrong, but whoever the witness was, the man was rejected.

9753. Do you recollect whether he stated his premises were worth 10 *l.* a year?—He swore they were.

9754. In fact, that was the uniform practice with them?—Yes.

9755. Do you remember the case of Thomas Collins, in White's-lane?—Yes; he was rejected.

9756. Do you remember the witness there?—I do not.

9757. Thomas Garrett, shoemaker?—I remember him; the barrister, on cross-examining him, found there was a man named Hayes registered out of the same house, and he rejected him.

9758. Do you remember John Lawler, mason?—I do; he was rejected.

9759. Was that on the examination of witnesses?—Yes, some witnesses were examined.

9760. Michael Mara, bootmaker?—He was rejected also.

9761. Upon the examination of a witness?—Yes.

9762. Now, having given that evidence, be so good as to attend to this evidence given by Mr. Joseph Higgins, (No. 2714): "How did it come that you attended only upon two days? I gave evidence in one case, and I heard my name called out frequently in the progress of those two days, and I declined giving evidence. There was a very high state of excitement, and the barrister did not give credit to my evidence; nor did he receive the evidence of the other valuers, the persons who spoke as to the value of premises. Do you mean that he did not receive evidence sustaining the alleged value of the house, or evidence rebutting it?"

Mr. Dennis Welch.

5 May 1837.

I do not mean to say that he refused to receive evidence; but he gave a preference to the persons that came up to register, saying that they were the best judges of the value of their own premises. Do you mean to say, that, in instances in which a claimant came up to register, and, in his own opinion, alleged the value of his house to be 10*l.*, if evidence was given to prove that it was not worth 10*l.*, the barrister still registered that man upon his own assertion? Yes; I say so. Even where the person claiming to register admitted that he did not pay 10*l.* for the place, nor anything like 10*l.*; he said it was worth to him 10*l.*; that was a very common expression, "It is worth 10*l.* to me." Now do you observe what is there stated by Mr. Joseph Higgins, that the barrister gave a preference to the persons that came up to register, saying, they were the best judges of the value of their own premises? Now, after having enumerated these several persons, who, notwithstanding their statement that premises were worth 10*l.*, still no witness being examined to disprove that statement, were rejected; do you conceive that this statement of Mr. Joseph Higgins is correct, that the barrister gave a preference to the persons who came up to register, over those who came to give evidence upon their oath?—I do not.

9764. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Were you in court when Mr. Higgins was examined in the case of Patrick Burke?—I was not.

9765. Mr. *Lefroy.*] Were you in court during the registering of all the men?—I was not; I was in and out.

9766. So that Mr. Higgins might have stated correctly what passed in his presence, although you were not apprized of it?—He might, but I was frequently in and out, and all the times I was in and out I saw the barrister receive evidence and reject; he rejected a great many persons where evidence was produced that the places were not of the value of 10*l.* a year.

9767. As far as you recollect, did he reject a greater number of persons than those I have enumerated?—I am sure he did a great many more.

9768. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Can you state whether the barrister rejected those persons whom I have enumerated, because he was satisfied their premises were not worth 10*l.* a year, intrinsically, or because he was satisfied that they were not worth 10*l.* to the individual?—Of course, where he was satisfied, where there was evidence produced that the premises were not worth 10*l.* a year, I say he invariably rejected the people.

9769. But do you mean worth 10*l.* a year to the claimant, or worth 10*l.* a year absolutely?—When the persons came up, he would ask them, "Where do you reside," and so on. "Do you occupy a house worth the clear yearly value of 10*l.* I do." Then another person came forward and swore that the house was not worth 10*l.* a year; I saw him reject in several cases, though the person himself swore it was of the clear yearly value of 10*l.*

9770. The clear yearly value absolutely, or to him?—I cannot say which; that was the question put, was it of the clear yearly value of 10*l.*, and the man swore it was, and other persons came forward and swore it was not, and he rejected him.

9771. But you cannot state an instance where the claimant ever swore they were worth 10*l.* to him, or 10*l.* absolutely?—All the persons I think, or almost all of them, said where they were living, and it is worth to me 10*l.* a year. That was generally said.

9772. Then, if the barrister were satisfied by evidence that the claimant was not stating what was the fact with regard to the premises being worth 10*l.* a year to him, of course he would reject him?—I certainly think he would; only the fact was, the conservative party, as they are called, felt so annoyed after the first or second day's proceedings that they were determined that they would not attend to it at all. They were there; Mr. Welch was employed, and I think more would have been rejected if they had come forward and given evidence; I have no doubt at all of it.

9773. Mr. *Serjeant Bull.*] So that, according to your evidence, it was not the fault of the barrister, but the fault of the conservative party, that these persons or some of them, whom you say were put improperly on the registry, were placed there?—Mr. Welch said, "My God, Sir, it is too bad that you will admit those;" and he said, "What am I to do, Mr. Welch, the man has sworn it is worth 10*l.*;" do you produce evidence, and then I will dispose of it."

9774. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Supposing a man to swear the premises were worth 10*l.* to him, and supposing another witness to come up and to swear the premises were

net worth 10 *l.* a year in the market, that would be no answer, that would be no counter-evidence as respects the right of the claimant to register, supposing the barrister to decide the value is to be the value which the individual sets upon it, and not the marketable value?—I saw the barrister reject a good many, particularly the first day, who did get opposition; he rejected a good many; but the conservative party got so hurt at some persons the barrister admitted, that they gave up, and said they would not produce evidence.

9775. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] That is, because they did not succeed in having all the persons whom they opposed rejected, they gave up any further opposition?—

Yes.

9776. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Are you aware Mr. Higgins has stated in his evidence, that in every case in which he was a witness, it was admitted by the claimants that the premises were not worth 10 *l.* absolutely, though he swore they were worth 10 *l.* to him?—I am not aware of that.

9777. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Just advert to these two or three questions and answers in Mr. Higgins' evidence, (No. 2894): "Is it your opinion that a house is not worth to a man more than the rent he pays for it? In some cases, a man letting lodgings, it might be worth to him more than the market value; that is to say, he might receive more? Yes. Do you imagine that a man pays for a house the extreme value of it to him? I rather think he does. That is your idea of the value? That is my idea in general. Are houses all let at a rack rent? Not at a rack rent. What do you mean by a rack rent? A rack rent is the extreme value. You were understood to say that it was the practice to let houses at the extreme value? The practice is to get the full value for the premises, and I would call the rack rent something beyond that." Now you have heard those answers; now will you advert to this, speaking of the house of Patrick Burke, (No. 2748), Mr. Higgins is asked, "What rent did he pay? I think 4 *l.* a year. What was the amount of the evidence which you gave to the barrister? I said that it was not 10 *l.* value; and I said that the extreme value of the place was 8 *l.*" Now, contrasting that statement with what I first read to you, do you see a very remarkable discrepancy between the statement that houses were let at their full value, and that in this instance the value of the house put by Higgins himself is double the rent; do you see a remarkable contradiction there?—I do.

9778. Now, in number 2725, the same Mr. Higgins is represented to have said this, or this question and answer occur: "Do you remember any declaration made by the barrister as to the intentions of the Legislature in the introduction of the Reform Act? I do. I remember that he stated that his opinion was, that it was the intention of the Legislature to extend the elective franchise to almost, if not altogether, to universal suffrage; that was his opinion, and that he would do so." Now you stated that you were in and out, generally present?—I was mostly every day during the registry.

9779. Did you hear any such statement as that?—I never heard him say any such thing.

9780. But from what you did hear him say, do you think it possible he could have stated that without your having heard it?—I do not; I was a good deal in and out, but I must have heard such a thing when there were so many persons registered. I think Mr. Bagwell's friends, several of them, said that Mr. Guthrie said he intended giving universal suffrage, or the Legislature intended it; and I heard every friend of the late Mr. Ronayne say, there never was a more damnable falsehood.

9781. Then there was a controversy as to whether Mr. Guthrie had said this or not; and it was denied in the most positive terms by Mr. Ronayne's friends?—Yes; every one of Mr. Ronayne's friends denied it. There would not have been so many registered only for the conservatives; they felt so hurt after the first day or two, that they did not attend to it.

9782. You have no doubt that, if the person concerned for the conservatives had called up witnesses and examined them to disprove the allegation as to the 10 *l.* value, that many of those persons that you say were improperly put upon the registry could not have been put there?—They would not.

9783. Perhaps all of them?—A great many of them would not.

9784. Mr. *Lefroy.*] Can you give any reason why they should have abandoned their own cause without any foundation whatever?—After the first witness or two were examined, they got so hurt at the persons that were admitted to register, that they would not attend to it.

939.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

5 May 1837.

9785. That is, hurt at the decisions that were made?—At the decisions that were made by the barrister.

9786. They considered it hopeless?—No; I do not think that.

9787. What else?—It was a very unpleasant situation for any man residing in the town of Clonmel to be going up to swear to the value; I am quite sure Mr. Higgins and Mr. Smith did not wish it at all; it is a most unpleasant situation for any man to go and swear his neighbour's house is not worth 10*l*.

9788. If the decisions were reasonable decisions, what was the unpleasantness of it?—Why, before their fellow townsmen to endeavour to prevent persons going forward to have their franchise.

9789. Then why should they have come forward in the first instance?—I heard one of the commissioners say, he thought he was obliged by law, when there was a summons served on him by the deputy clerk of the peace.

9790. But as to the others?—Mr. Shaw was the other person I was speaking of; he is a Roman Catholic, and I was speaking to him on the subject.

9791. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] I think it came to this, that although some persons, and you state several were rejected by the barrister, after witnesses were examined on behalf of the conservatives, still, inasmuch as others were admitted by him whom the conservatives thought ought to be rejected, they thought proper to give up examining further evidence?—They did; they gave up their opposition, and I think not so many would have been upon the registry if they had attended.

9792. Chairman.] On the liberal side were there any objections made to parties as to non-value?—Yes, there were.

9793. And did they bring witnesses forward?—They did; a great many witnesses on both sides.

9794. Who did they bring forward?—I cannot recollect just now.

9795. Did they bring forward any architect to support their objections as to the non-value of particular premises?—No.

9796. They brought forward no witnesses?—The liberals were, several of them, obliged to bring forward witnesses, where witnesses were produced on the other side.

9797. I am now talking of the objections made by the liberal side to persons claiming to register, but who were supposed to belong to Mr. Bagwell's party, and I want to know whether, in those cases, the liberals brought forward a witness to prove the non-value or the under value of the claimants to be so registered?—I do not recollect that they did.

9798. Do you believe that they did?—I do not recollect. In some cases they brought forward witnesses.

9799. But to prove the under value?—Yes, in some cases.

9800. State who those witnesses were?—In the case of John Bagge?

9801. Who were the witnesses brought forward to prove his not being of sufficient value?—I cannot exactly say, but there was a witness.

9802. Was it Mr Thornton?—No.

9803. Was he in the town at that time?—He was.

9804. And he is a man of experience?—Indeed he is.

9805. But you cannot state whether he was brought forward?—He did not attend the registry at all.

9806. Can you state any witness that was brought forward?—In that case there was some man who went forward and swore.

9807. Who was it?—I cannot tell.

9808. Can you remember any other case in which witnesses were brought to prove non-value against Mr. Bagwell?—Yes, there was another man of the name of Daniel, shoemaker.

9809. He was opposed?—He was.

9810. And was there a witness brought forward in his case?—Yes; and ~~there~~ he was a care-taker.

9811. Who was that witness?—I cannot say.

9812. At what period of the registry were these two persons opposed?—This was towards the latter end; Bagge was opposed in the commencement.

9813. Not

9813. Not exactly the first day?—I believe the second or third day; he was high up in the list.
9814. But with regard to the last man; he was opposed as not having sufficient value?—As being a care-taker.
9815. Well, that was nothing to do with the value then, was it?—No.
9816. Then, the only case that you can state at this moment to the Committee is the case of John Bagge, as being one of Mr. Bagwell's party, and applying to register for value under 10 £?—Yes.
9817. And which objection was supported by evidence?—No, it was opposed; and it was proved that the premises were not worth 10 £.
9818. Which objection, I say, was supported by evidence?—Yes, it was.
9819. That was the only case in which an objection was taken by your party in that registry, and was supported by evidence of non-value?—I do not now recollect any other; there might have been others.
9820. You remember the way in which this registry was carried on as against you, but not as for you?—I do not remember any person except the case of Bagge. The reason why I remember Bagge so well is, he was living in the county Waterford, and he was registered out of a small piece of ground he had.
9821. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Your attention has not been at all called to the objections made to the conservative party upon the registry?—No.
9822. You have not directed your attention to it?—No.
9823. And accordingly you do not recollect the particulars?—No.
9824. You were asked whether Mr. Thorston, or any other holder, was examined to establish the objections of the liberals against the conservative claimants; now do you recollect whether there was any holder examined on the other side?—I do not recollect there was.
9825. Mr. Tinsley, or whatever his name was?—I do not recollect.
9826. There was no holder examined on either side, as far as you know?—Not that I recollect.
9827. Chairman.] There were sworn valuers examined on the other side: were there not?—I did not myself see one.
9828. Was not Mr. Smith a sworn valuator?—He was.
9829. Was not Mr. Higgins a sworn valuator?—Yes.
9830. Were not they examined?—I heard that Mr. Higgins and Mr. Smith were examined.
9831. Do you doubt they were examined?—I think they were, but I do not think anybody you mentioned was examined in this case.
9832. In the case of Bagge, that is the only case?—That is the only one I recollect; there might have been more.
9833. And one individual was examined there?—Yes.
9834. And that person you do not know?—I do not recollect, it is so long ago.
9835. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then it appears the liberal party were more forthcoming in their objections than the conservative party?—I believe they were.
9836. They made fewer objections?—Yes, in fact up to this moment, no matter what rent they pay, if they pay a hundred a year, they are opposed by the conservatives in Clonmel, at every registry.
9837. Do they employ a solicitor for the purpose?—Counsel and solicitor.
9838. At every registry?—Yes, Lord Glengal, it is said, employs counsel (Mr. Muleahay) to attend to oppose the borough and the county registry.
9839. What has Lord Glengal to do with the borough?—They say he is looking after the representation of it for his brother-in-law, a son of Baron Pennefather.
9840. So the impression is you state, that Lord Glengal employs counsel and solicitor to oppose the registry of the liberal party; he is looking for the representation for his brother-in-law, the son of Baron Pennefather?—Yes.
9841. Mr. Lefroy.] What is your foundation for saying that?—It is said by every person, Lord Glengal is taking an active part; he attends the registry himself in person, and sits on the bench.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.
5 May 1837.

9842. Mr. Serjeant *Boll*.] Is he not a Peer of Parliament?—He is; and he gave instructions to Counsellor Mulcahey to oppose a tenant of his; one that was registered.

9843. And he sat on the bench at the registry?—He did.

9844. And gave instructions to counsel to oppose a man coming up to claim his franchise?—Yes.

9845. *Chairman*.] What was the name of that person?—I do not know.

9846. When was it?—Six months ago; the last session.

9847. When do you mean, by six months ago?—The sessions are generally held every six months.

9848. Which sessions?—Not the last sessions, but the sessions before that.

9849. Last January?—Yes.

9850. What part of January?—I cannot exactly state.

9851. You cannot state the name of the party to whom he objected?—No; I know the man very well; I can know from one of the witnesses outside if you wish the name of the person. It is either Ross or Welch. [*The witness stepped out and inquired the name of the person.*] It was James Welch, of Garrymore.

9852. Mr. Serjeant *Boll*.] Whose tenant was he?—Lord Glengal's.

9853. *Chairman*.] He was registered for the county, then, I suppose; he claimed to register for the county?—He did.

9854. Mr. Serjeant *Boll*.] And Lord Glengal, his own landlord, opposed him from the bench?—Yes; I saw him instructing counsel.

9855. Mr. *Lefroy*.] And the result was, that he was found not qualified?—He was rejected. His property got into Chancery somehow, and he could not produce his lease; he had to give up his lease; he could not produce his lease.

9856. Mr. Serjeant *Boll*.] Then it was not for want of value?—No, it was not; the man has a nice property; he gave the lease up to Mr. Chaytor, I think, while he was under difficulties.

9857. *Chairman*.] You never heard that the late Duke of Norfolk always claimed to vote?—I did not.

9858. Mr. Serjeant *Boll*.] Did you know the late Duke of Norfolk?—No.

9859. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Do you know any reason why a Peer of Parliament should not attend the registration?—I do not.

9860. Mr. Serjeant *Boll*.] Is it the general practice for Peers in the county of Tipperary to attend the registry, and fight the battle out with their tenants?—No.

9861. Did you ever know it in any other instance?—I never heard of it before.

9862. You never heard of such a thing in Ireland before; even in Ireland?—I did not.

9863. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Do not you think a Peer will be doing public justice if he can prevent fictitious claimants being placed on the registration?—I think any man that would prevent persons from getting fictitious votes would be doing justice to the public.

9864. Mr. Serjeant *Boll*.] Then you think it is a very hard thing that a Peer of Parliament is not allowed to interfere, if he pleases, in the election of Members of Parliament?—I am told that they cannot.

9865. Do you consider that a hardship?—I certainly would think it a great hardship.

9866. Do you mean to say, that you consider it a hardship on a Peer that he is not at liberty to interfere in the election of Members of Parliament?—No; I do not consider it a hardship.

9867. Then what you mean to say is, it would be a hardship on any person not a Peer to be prevented interfering?—Yes, just so.

Luna, 8^o die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.
Mr. O'Connell.
Sir Robert Ferguson.
Mr. Milnes Gaskell.
Mr. Hamilton.

Mr. Hogg.
Mr. Serjeant Jackson.
Mr. Lefroy.
Lord Granville Somerset.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Patrick J. Keily, called in; and further Examined.

[A Paper was handed to the Witness.]

9868. Chairman.] WHAT is the paper you hold in your hand?—This paper contains the names of certain householders in Clonmel, the streets, and the value annexed to each, from the valuation books in 1828 to the present time inclusive.

9869. The book of the commissioners?—The valuator's book under the 9th of Geo. 4, in the year 1828, and to the present time inclusive.

9870. Mr. Hamilton.] Is it the valuation of 1828 alone, or the valuation of 1828 as amended since?—As amended since to the present time inclusive.

[The Paper was handed in, a copy of which is as follows:]

FAMES.	STREETS.	Value in 1828, and still continues.	NAMES.	STREETS.	Value in 1828, and still continues.
Joshua Moore	Lower Johnson-st., at	£ 6	Richard O'Maher	Morton-street - at	7
Thomas Everard	- ditto - - at	6	Stephen Mars	Blind-street - at	—
David Thomson	Bagwell-street - at	14	Patrick Bake	Dispensary-street, at	6
William Hurley	- ditto - - at	7	William Carew	- ditto - - at	6
John Durney	Mary-street - at	8	Thomas Atkins	Dockett-street - at	7
Burkehan*Fennessy	Irishtown - - at	7	Patrick Walsh	William-street - at	11
Michael Power	Mary-street - at	8	Timothy Dooley	Dispensary-street, at	5
James Carigan	Shambles-lane - at	8	Gerald Russell	Peter-street - at	8
Thomas O'Brien	Bagwell-street - at	8	Michael Russel	Dispensary-street, at	6
William Maxcey	Lower Johnson-st., at	8	Jeremiah Myers	Upper Johnson-st., at	6
John Carway	Irishtown - - at	10	Edward Day	- ditto - - at	8
Peter O'Connor	South suburbs - at	9	Thomas Boyd	Dockett-street - at	6
William Dwyer	Irishtown - - at	10	Patrick Hickey	- ditto - - at	6
Thomas Manning	Mary-street - at	6	John Ryan	- ditto - - at	6
Ditto	- ditto - - at	6	John Everard	Bagwell-street - at	5
John Brown	Lower Johnson-st., at	10	James Gleeson	Cashell-road - at	—
Mrs. O'Reilly	Bagwell-street - at	15	William Davis	New-street - at	5
Mother Butler	Main-street - at	18	Martin Moroney	- ditto - - at	5
Patrick Mookler	Johnson-street - at	8	John Hennessey	Hopkins-lane - at	5
Richard Galton	Bolton-street - at	6	William Bouris	Dockett-street - at	6
John Carden	Mary-street - at	8	Michael Tobin	Kilshoban-street - at	—
William Walsh	Johnson-street - at	10	Michael Coanors	George's-court - at	6
Michael Mara	Brabon's-lane - at	5	Andrew Armstrong	Irishtown - - at	7
James Hackett	- - Salmon's-lane, off Johnson-street.	5	Paul Wisberry	Catherine-street - at	6
James Boyars	Upper Johnson-st., at	8	John Kennic	Bagwell-street - at	6
Michael Skelington	New Shambles-lane, at	6	John Coghlan	Boehrens (not valued in 1828, or at any of the subsequent valuations.)	—

By order, P. J. Keily,

Clerk to the Commissioners for Watching, Lighting, &c. the Town of Clonmel.

London, 9th May 1837.

Mr. Dennis Walsh, called in; and further Examined.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

8 May 1837.

9871. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] DO you know the house of Joshua Moore in Lower Johnson-street?—I do.
9872. Be so good as to look at this paper, which has been just authenticated by the last witness, and tell me what was the valuation of that house contained in that paper, the first in the list?—£6.
9873. Now, you know these premises?—I do.
9874. Do you know the rent that Joshua Moore has been in the habit of paying for his premises?—I think 15*l.*, as well as I can recollect.
9875. What ground of knowledge have you?—By different persons; the man next door told me it was 15*l.*
9876. But do you otherwise know it?—No, I do not.
9877. What do you say is the value of that house?—I should say it was worth about 15*l.*
9878. You say that is the value of this house?—I do.
9879. And you consider it well worth 15*l.* a year?—I do.
9880. And it is returned at 6*l.* in the valuation?—£6.
9881. *Chairman.*] What were Joshua Moore's politics?—I do not know that he ever voted; they are decidedly conservative, his politics.
9882. But he has never voted?—No, he did not.
9883. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But you say he is considered a conservative?—He is decidedly conservative, his politics are.
9884. *Chairman.*] But he never voted?—Never.
9885. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] What is he by trade, or is he in trade?—He is a letter-carrier to the post-office, at least delivers letters.
- 9885*. Besides that, is he not in some trade?—He carries on the haxtering business, I believe keeps a sort of eating-house.
9886. And he is decidedly conservative?—He is.
9887. Now, do you know of Thomas Everard in Johnson-street?—I do.
9888. Do you know the value of that house?—I do.
9889. Do you know the rent of his house?—I think he pays something about 11*l.*; I should suppose about that.
9890. What do you conceive to be the value of that house?—I think it is worth 12*l.* a year.
9891. Now, will you look into the valuation of 1828, and tell me what the valuation there is?—£6.
9892. Do you know David Thornton's house in Bagwell-street?—I do not.
9893. Do you know William Hurley's house in Bagwell-street?—I do.
9894. Do you know the value of that house?—£14 or 15*l.*, something about that, that is the rent he pays.
9895. Well, and what do you consider the value of it?—It is worth that, something about that; from the situation, it is worth from 13*l.* to 15*l.* a year.
9896. Will you look to the return there (No. 4), and see what it is valued at?—£7.
9897. Do you know John Durney's house in Mary-street?—I do.
9898. What is the value of that house?—It is worth 13*l.* or 14*l.*; I think that is the rent he pays.
9899. So that he actually pays 13*l.* or 14*l.* a year?—Yes.
9900. Well, what is that valued at?—£8.
9901. Do you know Michael Power's house in Mary-street?—I do.
9902. What is the value of that?—He told me, in the year 1832, it was either 12*l.* or 13*l.* that he paid; either 12*l.* or 13*l.*, I am not sure which.
9903. Well, the rent is that?—The rent is that.
9904. What do you find in the valuation?—£8.
9905. Do you know James Carigan's house, in Shamhles-lane, I think it is?—I do.
9906. Well, what is the value of that?—He pays over 12*l.* for it.
9907. He pays that rent?—Yes, he does.
9908. What value do you find for it in the valuation?—£8; I think I have some of his receipts.
9909. Have you got them about you?—I do not know whether I have them about me; if not, I have them at my lodgings.

9910. Did you know all the houses that I have examined you about in 1828? —I did. Mr. Dennis Walsh.
8 May 1857.
9911. Do you consider that their value in 1828 was greater or less than it is at the present day?—I think they are something higher in the present day; those houses are something higher.
9912. But not a great deal?—That is according to the situation of the houses; some are.
9913. Do you know whether the houses you speak of paid the same rent in 1828 as you represent them to pay now?—I am quite sure of that; I have not Carigan's receipt about me.
9914. Have you any other receipts for the rents of the houses that you speak of?—I think Hurley's receipt is here. I have it not here, but some of the gentlemen have.
9915. Do you know Thomas O'Brien's house, in Bagwell-street?—I do.
9916. What is the rent of that?—I think 12 l.; I think his receipt is here.
9917. You have seen the receipt?—I think I did; I am not very positive, but as well as I recollect it is 12 l.
9918. Well, what is the valuation of that?—£. 8.
9919. Eight pounds seems to have been a favourite valuation, I think; do you know William Maxcoy's premises?—I do.
9920. What do you take to be the value of them?—I do not know indeed whether it is 10 l. or 11 l. rent that he pays for them; I had his receipt in the year 1833, and I know from the landlord too.
9921. What is the value of that in the book?—£. 8.
9922. Do you know John Conway's house in the Irishtown?—I do.
9923. Do you know what rent that house pays?—That pays 11 l. odd; his receipt is here also. -
9924. What is the value of that house in the book?—£. 10.
9925. Do you know Peter O'Connor's?—I do.
9926. What is the value of that?—£. 9. it is valued at; he pays 10 l.
9927. Are you sure it is 9 l., because it is returned to me as 7 l.?—It is 9 l.
9928. And he actually pays 10 l.?—£. 10. he pays.
9929. [Sir Robert Ferguson.] Is there any difference in the valuation of any of those houses between 1828 and the present time?—No, there was no change made.
9930. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you mean to say that there has been no new valuation made of the houses included in the valuation of 1828?—Unless they were improved there was not.
9931. Then there was in cases in which they were improved?—Yes, I heard there was; I do not know myself; I heard there was.
9932. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And also if deteriorated, is not the valuation reduced?—I did not hear that.

Mr. Patrick J. Keily called in; and further Examined.

9933. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] DO the Committee understand you to state that the valuation of 1831 and 1834 in some instances comprised premises that had been before valued in 1828, but which had been either improved or deteriorated in value after that period?—As had been altered by way of improvements, and consequently of more value. Mr. P. J. Keily.
9934. Then did the commissioners, in their valuation of 1831 and 1834, include those premises so altered, and raise the valuation; was there any instance of that?—There was.
9935. Chairman.] Was there any alteration at all made by the commissioners, either in 1831 or 1834, in the first value put upon the houses under the 9th of George the 4th?—In some cases where there were appeals.
9936. What description of cases?—The houses generally, in such cases, rated at 20l. and upwards, where there were alterations.
9937. Then am I to understand the commissioners did not think it their duty to alter the houses under the 10l. class?—To alter them in point of valuation? no.
9938. They completely overlooked that?—The commissioners did not find that necessary.
9939. They

Mr. P. J. Kelly.

8 May 1837.

9939. They did think it their duty to alter houses under 20*l.*?—Yes, that were improved since 1828.
9940. Supposing a 5*l.* house was made worth 10*l.*, they did not think it their duty to alter that?—I do not know a single instance of that sort in the town.
9941. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Do you know whether they acted upon that principle in making an alteration in the value of houses under 20*l.*?—I am certain they have acted on that principle on houses rated upwards of 10*l.*
9942. Are we to understand you to mean this, then, that where any houses, the valuation of which was altered by them in 1831 or 1834, were houses above the value of 10*l.* in the valuation of 1828?—Yes.
9943. And that in no instance did they alter the valuation of 1828, where the premises were under the value of 10*l.* in that valuation?—In no instance.
9944. That is your impression?—That is my impression.
9945. I want to know whether, in any case, they reduced the valuation of 1828 by reason of the premises being reduced in value?—I believe in some cases, when there were appeals lodged in 1831 against the entire valuation, and likewise when there were appeals in 1834; and in some cases I believe the valuation of the houses might have been reduced on the hearing of appeals.
9946. Do you mean to say that in 1831 and 1834 there were appeals against the valuation of 1828?—There was a valuation made in 1831 and in 1834; the whole valuation then was open to appeal, and there were some appeals.
9947. That includes the valuation of 1828?—Yes.
9948. Then do I understand you to mean there were appeals in 1831 and 1834 against the valuation of 1828?—Against the whole valuations of 1828, 1831 and 1834, including the valuation of 1828.
9949. Then the commissioners entertained those appeals?—They did.
9950. And you say they reduced the value in some instances?—In a very few cases.
9951. And was that by reason of the premises being reduced in value since 1828?—The appeals were for excessive value, as well as I recollect.
9952. Do you mean for excessive value in the valuation made in 1828, or for value becoming excessive by reason of the depreciation of value subsequent to 1828?—By reason of the valuation made in 1831 and 1834, and by reason of the depreciation of value subsequent to 1828.
9953. That was of new houses?—Yes; that had not been valued in 1828.
9954. Are you speaking now entirely of new houses that had not been valued in 1828, or do you confine your observation to houses that were in existence in 1828 as well as to those that were built subsequent?—I do.
9955. Which is it?—I confine my knowledge to premises of the years 1828, 1831 and 1834.
9956. Take that valuation of 1831, and point out if you can any instance in which any alteration has been made in the valuation of any house that was made in 1828?—I can refer, if you please, to the appeal-books.
9957. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Turn to the house of Henry Pedder, and tell me what the valuation of his house was in 1828?—Henry Pedder, esq., house and grounds, in the valuation book of 1828, 110*l.*
9958. What was the amount he was liable to pay according to the valuation in 1834?—Houses and grounds, 118*l.*
9959. *Chairman.*] When was that increase made?—In 1834.
9960. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Did Mr. Pedder ever apply to you for a copy of the valuation?—He did.
9961. Did you give it him?—No.
9962. *Chairman.*] Why not?—Some two or three months ago he applied to me for a copy of the rate book, and tendered me 1*l.* for the copy. I did not conceive that a reasonable remuneration, and I consequently declined giving him a copy of the rate book.
9963. Mr. *Hamilton.*] What is your salary per annum?—£.20 a-year.
9964. *Chairman.*] What does the Act of Parliament say upon that, as to the refusal of a copy of the valuation?—[*The Witness referred to the Act.*]
9965. What is the section?—Section 35.
9966. Is not the substance of that this, that a person demanding a copy of the whole or any part of such estimate or valuation shall tender a reasonable charge for the same?—It is.
9967. Then did you not consider 1*l.* a reasonable charge?—No, I did not.
9968. What

9968. What charge did you make?—Mr. Pedder asked for an entire copy of this book.
9969. What did you consider a reasonable charge?—I considered 1s. a page a reasonable charge; there are 79 pages.
9970. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Ruled in that way?—Yes.
9971. Mr. *Hamilton.*] How long would it take you to make out a copy of that book; you made a copy for the Committee lately, I believe?—I did; I think it would take me from four to six days.
9972. Did it take that to make out the return you made for the Committee?—It did. I think it occupied me six days.
9973. *Chairman.*] And you did nothing else?—I did; because it was the assizes at Tipperary, and I had other business to look after, and to go through the town to several places to see if I could ascertain the numbers of the houses; and I found in several instances the numbers were painted off the houses, and I had great difficulty in that respect.
9974. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Had Mr. Pedder an opportunity of seeing the amount he was valued at when he applied to you?—He had.
9975. Did he actually see it?—Indeed I cannot say; it is very possible he did; he was on the premises the day I accompanied the valuator to his place.
9976. But did he see in your book the altered valuation, at the period when he asked you for the copy?—I had not the book then with me.
9977. *Chairman.*] Did Mr. Pedder make that application in writing or verbally?—He made it, in the first instance, verbally to me.
9978. And in the second instance?—And in the second instance he applied in writing to the chairman of the commissioners.
9979. Have you got that writing with you?—No.
9980. What did that writing specify?—Requiring a copy of this book, and in fact a copy of the minutes of all the commissioners' proceedings, &c.
9981. You mean to say he applied to you for a copy of the whole book?—He applied to me for an entire copy of this book.
9982. You are quite sure it was the whole book?—The whole of it.
9983. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Can you state who the commissioners were that were present when that application was refused; have you, in the minute-book, the means of informing the Committee who the commissioners were that refused that application of Mr. Pedder's?—I have not the names, inasmuch as the minute-book is in Clonmel.
9984. Mr. Pedder is a conservative?—I believe he is.
9985. He was employed on the part of the conservative party?—He was.
9986. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Did you say that he required a copy of the minutes of all the proceedings of the commissioners?—He did, as well as my memory serves me.
9987. Do you find anything in the Act of Parliament entitling him to a copy of the minutes of the proceedings?—I think not.
9988. Well, he required also, you say, a copy of the entire of that book?—He did.
9989. Was that necessary to enable him to know the valuation of his own premises?—I should think not.
9990. Then for what purpose do you think he applied for a copy of the entire of that book?—I cannot tell.
9991. Mr. *Hogg.*] How many pages are there in that book?—Seventy.
9992. How many pages would an ordinary copying clerk, occupied the ordinary number of hours a day, copy of that book in a day?—I should say from 15 to 20, for it requires a good deal of accuracy, there are so many figures, you must be very particular likewise in comparing.
9993. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Do I understand you to say he required a copy of the entire of that book?—He did.
9994. Because I see there are a great many back arrears; was he entitled, under the Act of Parliament, to a copy of the back arrears?—I conceive, under the Act of Parliament, he might have been entitled to the names, the streets, and the valuation, but no more.
9995. That is to say, in the words of the Act, to a copy of the whole or any part of the estimate or valuation, that is what you think he was entitled to under the Act of Parliament?—Yes.
9996. Then do I understand you to say, that besides that, he required a copy of everything in that book?—He did.

Mr. P. J. Kelly.

8 May 1837-

9997. The first thing in that book is a list of arrears?—The first thing is the names, the streets, the denomination, the taxes, what we call the current taxes, and a list of all the arrears from the adoption of the Act in 1828 to the present time inclusive.

9998. Mr. Hogg.] Was the first application made to you by Mr. Pedder by word of mouth or in writing?—By word of mouth.

9999. Then state as distinctly and accurately as you can the precise nature of that application?—As well as I can recollect, I was going into the court, and I met Mr. Pedder in the hall of the court, and he asked me if Mr. Kellett had applied to me for a copy of the book.

10000. Mr. Pedder is a solicitor?—Yes. I said not; then Mr. Pedder desired me to acquaint the chairman of it, and I did so.

10001. Chairman.] Of what?—Of his application.

10002. What was his application?—For a copy of the rate-book.

10003. Mr. Hogg.] Had that gentleman who asked you for a copy of the rate-book ever seen this book?—I cannot say he did; I think it is possible he did.

10004. Did you understand his application to imply anything beyond a copy of the names, numbers and valuations?—At that time I did not.

10005. I do not suppose he applied for any copy of all the arrears for past years?—At a subsequent period?

10006. No; confine yourself to my question; at the time when he asked you for a copy of the rate-book, you say you understood him to mean what is implied by the Act of Parliament, a copy of the estimate or valuation?—At that time he asked me if Mr. Kellett had applied to me for a copy of the rate-book; I said not; and he said then "Now I do require it, and you had better acquaint the chairman;" and I accordingly acquainted the chairman of it.

10007. By that application, did you understand anything beyond an application for the estimate or valuation to which he was entitled under the Act of Parliament?—I understood his application to be for a copy of the rate-book.

10008. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] That you understood in the first instance?—Yes; because he expressly said so.

10009. Mr. Hogg.] Had he ever seen the rate-book?—My impression is that he did.

10010. Mr. Hamilton.] Had not his application to you immediate reference to the altered valuation of his own premises?—Not at all.

10011. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] He said nothing about that?—No.

10012. He did not allude to that at all?—No.

10013. State what occurred subsequently?—

10014. Mr. Hogg.] Do you consider it your duty, under this Act of Parliament, to keep a copy of the estimate or valuation required by this Act of Parliament?—I do.

10015. Do you think it proper to incumber that estimate with arrears, or any other irrelevant matter?—I do not understand the question.

10016. Do you think it right to incumber that book with a vast number of columns of arrears or other irrelevant matter not relating to the information which the applicant wants?—I do; the rate-books contain a copy similar to that.

10017. The word "rate-book" does not occur in the Act of Parliament?—What we call a rate-book.

10018. Did you tender to this applicant a copy of the information necessary for him to know, unincumbered by all those unnecessary columns?—I did not.

10019. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You did not tender anything?—No.

10020. Mr. Hogg.] Did you inform him, when he asked for a copy of the rate-book, that the rate-book contained a great deal of matter independent of the valuation?—I did not; but when Mr. Pedder applied to me in person, in the commissioners' office, by appointment, I pointed out to Mr. Pedder that the book contained several columns and pages, and showed him the book; he said he wanted an entire copy of that book, and then tendered me 1*l.* for so doing, and I declined it.

10021. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Are you sure it was after you called his attention to it that he said he wanted an entire copy of that book?—It was.

10022. This was at a subsequent period to the first conversation?—Yes.

10023. Mr. Hogg.] Your attention has been called to this Act of Parliament?—Yes.

10024. Do you consider 1*l.* a fair and adequate remuneration for furnishing a copy of the information which Mr. Pedder had a right to demand under this clause of the Act?—I did not consider that Mr. Pedder's tender was a reasonable compensation to me for the trouble I would have in making out a copy of that rate-book which he so required.

10025. Do you or not consider 1*l.* a fair and adequate remuneration for affording to Mr. Pedder a copy of that information to which he is entitled under this clause of the Act of Parliament?—I do not.

10026. You observe, by this Act, that you are bound to furnish the copy within three days?—Yes, I perceive that; that is, I conceive, if the application be made at a proper time; but I think the application, with great respect, should be made when the valuation is open for inspection for a certain number of days once in three years, when appeals are lodging in pursuance of the Act.

10027. When was this application of Mr. Pedder's?—I should say about two months ago; about that.

10028. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Was it after you had heard this Committee was appointed?—I cannot say.

10029. Mr. Hogg.] Was it about the period when you first heard this Committee was appointed?—I think it was.

10030. Did you make and keep a fair copy of the estimate and valuation, such as you are required to make and keep by the 35th section of the Act?—I did; the books were open for the inspection of the rate-payers; all the valuation books were open for the inspection of the rate-payers during that time, pursuant to that section of the Act of Parliament, and that, I believe, occurs once in three years.

10031. Then I understand you that, putting the arrears out of the question, you did not consider 1*l.* a fair remuneration for a copy of the estimate and valuation, putting the arrears out of the question?—I did not.

10032. I observe that this book contains 11 columns, and of these 11 columns, eight out of the 11 are arrears?—There are 15 columns altogether.

10033. The whole of this side consists of arrears?—Yes.

10034. Therefore no part of this was information that he had a right to require or you were bound to give under this Act of Parliament?—I think not, although he required it.

10035. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You are quite clear he required it?—Quite clear.

10036. Mr. Hogg.] Then give me leave to ask, omitting that, do you or not consider 1*l.* a fair remuneration for a copy of the rest of the book, being the part which he had a right to require, and which it was your duty to afford?—I do not think it was; it was on that point alone we differed.

10037. Then in your answers you confine yourself exclusively to the portion he was entitled to have a copy of?—I do, in answer to your last question.

10038. You say that a person would be about three days making a copy of the whole of this book?—I should think he would be six days making a copy of the whole of it.

10039. My question was, how long an ordinary copying clerk, employed during the ordinary times of the day, would be making a copy of this book, and you told me he would do about 15 or 20 pages a day?—I cannot say; but so far as I am concerned myself, I think, between making out the entire book and comparing, it would cost me six days, and has cost me six days.

10040. Mr. Hamilton.] The entire book, including the arrears?—Including the arrears.

10041. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then, do I understand you to mean that, in addition to writing out the copy, you go through the process of comparing it with the original?—Decidedly.

10042. Chairman.] How many days would it take to compare the original and the copy?—I should think a day.

10043. Do you think you could do it in a day?—Yes.

10044. A very long day I suppose it would be, would it not?—The collector and I were from 10 to 4 comparing it; he held one book in his hand, and I held the other in mine and then I took his book, and read to him, so as to have it compared correctly.

10045. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Comparing it crosswise?—Yes.

10046. Chairman.] Do you think you could do that in six hours?—I should think it would take me about that time.

Mr. P. J. Keely.

8 May 1837.

10047. You and another person?—Me and another person; I read tolembly quick.
10048. Doing it with great quickness, you could do it in six hours?—I think I could in a day.
10049. Are you quite sure of that?—I should think so.
10050. Then you think it would take 30 hours to copy that book?—It would take me thirty hours to copy that book.
10051. And you think you have no business to work more than six hours a day?—Those are the office hours by the Act of Parliament.
10052. Had the office hours anything to do with that particular part of the statute?—I believe not with that particular part of the statute.
10053. How many hours a day would you have taken to copy that book?—I should say from ten to four each day.
10054. Does your salary run on all the time?—My salary is 20 l. a year.
10055. And it runs on all the time?—Yes.
10056. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] If you worked out of office hours, would you not expect a higher rate of remuneration than if you worked during the office hours?—Decidedly.
10057. And if you employed another person to assist you in comparing out of office hours, he would expect more remuneration than if he assisted you during office hours?—The collector does not require anything for his assistance in that respect.
10058. Does he do that gratuitously?—He is obliged to assist me in comparing.
10059. Mr. *Hogg*.] Then you refused the information to Mr. Pedder unless he paid you 70 s.?—Yes; I declined giving Mr. Pedder a copy of the rate-book.
10060. You declined giving him the information he was entitled to under this Act of Parliament, unless he paid you 70 s.?—I declined giving Mr. Pedder a copy of the rate-book, as he so required, unless he paid me 1 s. a page for 70 pages.
10061. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] In other words, he required more than he was entitled to under the Act of Parliament, is it not so?—He certainly did, in my judgment.
10062. Because he required a copy of the arrears in addition to the other?—Yes, and I demanded 1 s. a page for so doing.
10063. *Chairman*.] Did you state to him he had required more than the Act of Parliament authorized him to demand?—As well as my recollection bears me out, I did observe that to him.
10064. On the first occasion?—Not on the first.
10065. On the second occasion?—When he was in the commissioners' office with me.
10066. And when he made the tender of the 1 l.?—Yes, and when I called his attention to the book.
10067. Did he make any observation upon that?—He did.
10068. What was it?—He told me his own clerk would copy it in a day, I think he mentioned a day or two.
10069. Did he make any reply to your observation, that he had demanded more than the Act of Parliament authorized him to demand?—I do not recollect he did.
10070. Are you quite sure you stated to him he did ask that which the Act of Parliament did not authorize him to demand?—As far as my recollection bears me out, I said so.
10071. On the second occasion?—On the second occasion.
10072. Who was present?—I believe the collector.
10073. What is his name?—Michael Guishion.
10074. He made no reply to that?—He told me he conceived 1 l. was a sufficient remuneration for me.
10075. He made no reply on the other hand?—Not that I recollect.
10076. But your objection was a double one; first, that he did not offer enough of money, and next, that he demanded more than the Act of Parliament authorized him to demand?—That was the principal objection, not giving me a fair remuneration for a copy of the rate-book he so required.
10077. Was there any other objection on your part but that?—There was not.
10078. Then what do you infer by stating to the Committee you observed to him he demanded more than the Act of Parliament authorized him to demand?—

As well as my recollection serves me, I asked Mr. Pedder, was it the names, the denominations and the valuations he wanted upon that occasion; and he said, not that, but he wanted an entire copy of that book.

10079. That you are quite sure of?—I am.

10080. Then the objection was, that he wanted a copy of the whole book; was that it?—No, that was not my objection; I had no objection to give him an entire copy of the book, provided he paid me what I considered a fair remuneration.

10081. Did you tell him you would give him it for less money, but that he had not a right to demand it under the Act of Parliament?—I cannot recollect that; my impression is I did not, because he wanted an entire copy of the book.

10082. You did not tell him, "I will give you that which you are authorized by the Act of Parliament to demand for less money than that which you must give me for a copy of the whole book?"—I think not.

10083. Nothing to that effect?—Nothing that I can recollect.

10084. You did not state to him there was any objection on your part to furnish him with a copy of the whole book, because the Act of Parliament did not authorize it?—I did not, as far as my recollection goes.

10085. And you did not raise any legal point to him as to the period at which he might demand it?—No; I did not.

10086. You differed entirely and alone on the point of money?—Precisely so.

10087. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] He did not ask you if you would give him that part of it which he was entitled to under the Act of Parliament at a lower rate than if he had the entire?—He did not, because he wanted a copy of the entire.

10088. And nothing short of it?—And nothing short of it.

10089. Now you were saying he observed, his clerk would copy it in a day or two?—Yes.

10090. That he had made that observation to you?—Yes.

10091. You were proceeding to say you made some observation in reply; what was that?—I said I did not think it was possible he could.

10092. Did nothing more pass; I mean nothing more relative to the subject?—No, nothing more; he retired.

10093. Mr. Hegg.] I ask you why you stated nothing to the Committee about this gentleman having required more than he was entitled to by the Act of Parliament, until I drew your attention to it, as you now state it was one of your prominent objections?—I did not think it material, my attention not being drawn to it until you drew my attention to it.

10094. Then you considered it quite immaterial his having asked more than he was entitled to under the Act of Parliament?—I had no objection to furnish him with a copy of the entire book; I made no objection to the particular part the Act of Parliament entitled him to, my objection was as to the sum that he tendered me.

10095. If I were to tell you that an attorney's clerk would copy as much of this book as Mr. Pedder was entitled to demand, or you were required to give, for 10s., and be well paid for his trouble, would you think that was very far wrong?—I should not think it a fair remuneration, as far as I am concerned.

10096. I confine my question to a person whose business it is to copy; for it is your business to employ a competent person under the Act of Parliament, who can copy quickly, well and cheaply?—My opinion is, that would not be by any means a fair remuneration to him.

10097. Then state to me distinctly what would be a fair remuneration to a copier of the portion that you were bound to give of this book, under the Act of Parliament?—I should think about 2*l.*; from 1*l.* 15*s.* to 2*l.* would be what I conceive to be a fair remuneration.

10098. For that portion of it?—For that portion of it.

10099. Chairman.] And what did you demand?—A shilling a page for 70 pages.

10100-1. Then you demanded 3*l.* 10*s.*?—Yes, for a copy of the entire book.

10102. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Including what he was not entitled to ask under the Act of Parliament?—What I conceived he was not entitled to under the Act of Parliament.

Mr. P. J. Keily.

8 May 1857.

10103. When you say you asked 3*l.* 10*s.*, did not that include what he was not entitled to ask under the Act of Parliament?—Of course it did.

10104. Mr. *Hawilton*.] Did you ever consult the commissioners as to the charge you might make for a copy of the rate book?—I did.

10105. What instructions did you receive from them; or did you receive any?—The impression of some of the commissioners was, that my charge was a reasonable one.

10106. Which of the commissioners did you consult?—I consulted the chairman.

10107. Who was he?—Mr. *Lacy*.

10108. And it was his opinion that your charge was a fair one?—He gave me no opinion as to that. And I consulted Mr. *Bianucci*; but other commissioners conceived it to be a fair remuneration.

10109. Have other and similar applications for information been frequently made by rate-payers?—Not frequently; I know of no instance except one.

10110. Well, has there been any difficulty interposed, either in the way of charge or in any other way, to prevent their seeing the amount of their valuations?—Not in the slightest, except in lodging the appeals; the clerk is entitled to 1*s.* on receiving an appeal.

10111. Are you a voter in Clonmel yourself?—I have ceased to be a voter since the 25th of March last.

10112. Did you vote at the last election?—I did not.

10113. Or the preceding one?—No.

10114. Have you ever filled up notices for claimants to register?—I have.

10115. In many instances?—A great many, in 1833; I have not meddled much since in that respect.

10116. Were you clerk at that time to the commissioners?—I was clerk to the commissioners; in August 1831 I commenced.

10117. Now on whose behalf did you fill up notices?—On behalf of the late Mr. *Ronnayne*.

10118. Have the commissioners at any period, or any of them, given you any directions with respect to filling up notices or attending to the registry?—Not in their capacity as commissioners; but my impression is, that there were some of them of Mr. *Ronnayne's* committee.

10119. But that was not in the room as commissioners?—Certainly not.

10120. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Now Mr. *Pedder*, you have stated, in answer to a question of the Honourable Member for Dublin, is a conservative?—I believe he is.

10121. He was, I believe, employed in the conservative interest, was he not, at the late elections, some of them?—He was assessor, I believe, at the election; or deputy, I think was the name of it.

10122. Deputy-sheriff, I presume, you mean?—Yes, he took the poll.

10123. Then he was not acting for the conservatives in that instance; he was acting for the sheriff or the returning officer?—I believe for the returning officer.

10124. The returning officer is the mayor?—Yes.

10125. There is no sheriff; well, he was acting as deputy for the mayor; he took the poll?—Yes.

10126. And he is understood to be in the conservative interest, you say?—He is; he voted upon that occasion for Mr. *Bagwell*.

10127. And do not you know he has exerted himself a good deal in the conservative interest?—I am quite sure he has.

10128. Very much?—Very much.

10129. Have you any doubt that his application to you for a copy of the entire of that book was for the purpose of serving the conservative interest in some way, with reference to the election; of obtaining information for their guidance with reference to the election?—I really do not know for what purpose he wanted it.

10130. Can you form no conjecture?—My opinion is, that it was to serve the conservative interest in some way.

10131. For the purpose of serving the conservative interest?—Yes; but of course I did not take that into account when he demanded a copy of the rate-book.

10132. That is to say, that although you had reason to believe that his object in requiring a copy of the rate-book was to serve the conservatives, with refer-

ence

ence to the election, you did not decline giving him a copy of that part of the book which by the Act he had no right to require?—I did not.

10133. Although you were aware you might have refused him that?—I think I might.

10134. Still you were willing to give it to him; and the only difference between you was, the rate at which you should be paid for copying it?—I was perfectly willing, and that was the only difference.

10135. You stated you never voted yourself?—I did not.

10136. Although you were an elector?—I do not think I was an elector, unless at Mr. Ball's election; I was then an elector.

10137. Mr. Hogg.] Did you ever furnish a copy of that book, or any portion of it, to any person?—I did not.

10138. Did any person, except Mr. Pedder, ever require it?—Mr. Kellett required it, I believe, some two years ago.

10139. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] That is the partner of Mr. Pedder?—Yes.

10140. He takes an interest, too, in the election on behalf of the conservatives, does he not?—He does.

10141. Mr. Hamilton.] If it were stated that difficulties and obstacles were thrown in the way of people seeking to know the amount of their valuations, would that be true or not?—By no means true.

10142. Chairman.] Quite the reverse?—Quite the reverse; I am at all times prepared to afford any information that any of the rate-payers may require as regards the valuation-books or the minutes.

10143. Point out to the Committee all the cases of increase or alteration in the value which appear upon your book; prepare that, and give it in.

10144. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Answer me this question; confine your attention to this; I want to know whether, in the valuation of 1831 or 1834, you can point out any instance in which a valuation made in 1828 was reduced by reason of the premises valued in 1828 being reduced in value subsequent to that period?—There have been some instances, I think.

10145. You are not sure?—I am not quite sure.

10146. Could you point out any?—I could, by reference to the appeal-books.

10147. But not otherwise?—I do not think I could accurately do it, without reference to the appeal-books.

The Examination of Mr. Dennis Walshe resumed.

10148. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] THE last person I asked you about, I believe, was Peter O'Connor?—Yes. Mr. Dennis Walshe.

10149. I believe you had given me full answers to that, had you not?—I went for the receipt.

10150. What is the amount of his rent?—£.10. I have the receipt of Joshua Moore also.

10151. State what is his rent, appearing by that receipt?—£.15 a year.

10152. Chairman.] What is the date of the receipt?—This is 1832.

10153. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Have you any earlier?—I have.

10154. What is the date of the earliest receipt you have got?—The 30th of November 1831 is the earliest I have.

10155. Is that 15*l.* a year?—It is.

10156. What is the next receipt?—15th August 1832.

10157. You have only those two receipts?—No.

10158. And they both ascertain the rent to be 15*l.* at that period?—Yes.

10159. Have you any reason to know whether the value of that house was the same, or was greater or less, or higher or lower, in 1828 than it was in 1832?—It was improved, I believe, within the last six months.

10160. I am speaking of the two periods, 1828 and 1832?—I saw no improvement made in it.

10161. Then you take the value of the house to have been the same in 1828 as the value in 1832?—Yes.

10162. Have you any reason to know be paid the same rent in 1828 as in 1832?—I do not know.

10163. Mr. Leffroy.] Have you any knowledge but what you collect from those receipts?—Yes; I heard from the tenant, at the time when I was coming over
0.59. here,

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

8 May 1837.

here, and from Mr. Glissan, the landlord; he told me the rent of it at the time I was coming over in 1833.

10164. Mr. Glissan is a liberal, is he not?—He is.

10165. I see that those receipts are given about the time of the first registry under the Reform Act?—No, I got those receipts when I was coming over here in the year 1833.

10166. But I see that the period of them is just about the time of the registry under the Reform Act?—It is, I believe, the last half year they paid before the petition was presented. The way it was, we got the receipts as near as we could to the time at which the petition was presented.

10167. *Chairman.*] You say you got those receipts for the object of the Committee?—Yes.

10168. Mr. Serjeant *Bell.*] And you say you got the receipts as near as you could to the period of the petition?—Yes, the half year before it; I got some receipts for two or three years before that, which I gave back when I went home.

10169. Do you mean Joshua Moore's?—No, other, different receipts.

10170. Mr. *Lefroy.*] Did you get but those two?—I got several receipts at the time, but I was obliged to give them up.

10171. Were they for the same amount?—They were all for 15*l.*

10172. Mr. Serjeant *Bell.*] And you are quite sure that you had receipts for an earlier period, ascertaining the rent of the premises to be 15*l.*?—I had; I had different receipts.

10173. And you gave them back?—I gave them back; I was obliged to give them back.

10174. Have you any doubt those are genuine receipts?—I have not; there are persons here who would prove them; I consider myself now as on my oath. I know Mr. Glissan's writing, as deputy clerk of the peace, and his father's; this is his handwriting; and I went to Mr. Hughes at the time of my coming over, and I asked him if that was Peter O'Connor's writing, and he told me it was.

10175. So that you took some pains to ascertain the genuineness of those receipts before you came over?—Yes, I did; and there were other gentlemen with me at the time.

10176. Now, do you know the premises of William Dwyer?—I do; I have his receipt here.

10177. Well now, what rent does that pay?—*£*5. 15*s.* the half-year.

10178. That is, 11 guineas?—Yes.

10179. Now be so good as look at the valuation, and tell me what appears to be the valuation of that house?—*£*10.

10180. Now, do you know Thomas Manning's house?—I do.

10181. In Mary-street?—I do.

10182. Do you know the rent that that pays?—I think that pays 12*l.* or 12*l.* 10*s.*, as well as I can recollect; there is another gentleman that is here who can speak to that, but I think that is the rent he pays.

10183. Do you know the value of the house?—I do.

10184. What should you consider the value of it?—It is worth that.

10185. Now tell me what is the valuation of that house in the valuation?—*£*6.

10186. Then your evidence is, that it pays 12*l.* or 12*l.* 10*s.*, and you consider it well worth that?—Yes, 12*l.* or 12*l.* 10*s.*, as near as I can recollect; there are persons that will tell you exactly.

10187. Do you know the premises of Edward Harwood?—I do.

10188. Do you find him in that paper?—I do.

10189. Well, what valuation do you find put upon them?—*£*6.

10190. On Edward Harwood's?—Yes; I do not see any name; "ditto" I see after the other.

10191. You take that to be 6*l.*?—Yes.

10192. Which do you consider the best house of the two?—Manning's is much better.

10193. Much better?—It is a larger one; Harwood is the head landlord of all the premises.

10194. Then Harwood's own house is smaller?—Yes.

10195. And yet it is valued at the same rate?—The same. He is an elector, Harwood is.

10196. Do

10196. Do you know John Brown's house?—I do.
 10197. Do you know the rent of that house?—I have his receipt here.
 10198. Well, what is it?—£. 14 a year.
 10199. Now will you tell me what valuation appears for that?—£. 10.
 10200. Do you know the widow Reilly's house, in Bagwell-street?—I do not.
 10201. Do you know the house of Messrs. Matthew & James Butler?—
 I do.
 10202. What is the rent of that house?—£. 20 a year.
 10203. And what is the valuation of that house in the book?—£. 18.
 10204. Do you know Patrick Mokler's house?—I do.
 10205. What is the rent of that?—£. 11.
 10206. £. 11 or 12 l., which?—I think 11 l.
 10207. Do you happen to know whether the tenant paid a fine for that?—He
 did; he paid something going into it.
 10208. *Chairman.*] How came you to know that?—I heard him say it.
 10209. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Then what do you take to be the value of that
 house?—It is worth about 12 l. a year.
 10210. Well, now what is that house valued at in the book of 1828?—£. 8.
 Here is Harwood's receipt in Manning's case; 6 l. the half year.
 10211. Do you know Richard Guiton's house?—I do.
 10212. In Bolton-street?—In Bolton-street.
 10213. What is the rent of that house; do you know?—I have his receipt
 here; he told me himself what he paid for it; 10 guineas a year he pays for it.
 10214. Now, what is the valuation of that house in the book?—£. 9.
 10215. Do you know John Carden's?—I do.
 10216. Well, what is the rent of that?—£. 14 a year.
 10217. Now be so good as to tell me what is the valuation of that?—£. 8.
 10218. Do you know the widow Eaton's house, in Johnson-street?—I do.
 10219. Well, what rent does that pay?—I do not know what rent the widow
 Eaton pays.
 10220. Do you know the value of the house?—I should suppose about 12 l.
 or 13 l. a year; she has the lower part of it set for 10 l. a year.
 10221. You consider that that could be got for it, if it were to be let?—Yes;
 she has all the up stairs and the hall-door to herself, and she gets 10 l. for the
 shop and the little parlour inside it; here is the receipt for it.
 10222. Well, what do you say about the next door?—Joshua Moore lives
 next door but one.
 10223. What is the valuation of that house in the book?—£. 10.
 10224. So that the valuation in this very high estimate of the whole house,
 is exactly what the widow Eaton gets for the shop and the little parlour within?
 —Yes, the shop and parlour.
 10225. Now, do you know Michael Mara's house?—Yes.
 10226. What is the rent of that?—£. 9. 2 s.
 10227. What is the valuation of that house?—£. 5.
 10228. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Have you the receipt of Mara's?—No, I have not;
 I had it from his landlord; I know for his house at this moment he could get
 14 l. or 15 l., for he has laid out money in building.
 10229. But you say you had the receipt before?—I had in the year 1833.
 10230. Well, and what became of that receipt?—I was obliged to give it to
 him; when I went back I was obliged to give several receipts back; his landlord
 told me the rent.
 10231. Do you know James Hackett's house?—I do.
 10232. Well, what is the rent of that house?—His receipt is here; some per-
 son has it; his landlord told me 10 l. a year he paid for it; I was by when he
 swore he paid 10 l. a year for it, when he was registered by Mr. Hohson; 10 l.
 a year was his rent.
 10233. What do you find to be the valuation?—£. 5.
 10234. Well now, suppose it appeared on that valuation, that the premises
 were only valued at 5 l., do you consider that that ought to affect the right of
 James Hackett to have registered?—I do not think it ought.
 10235. In other words, I have asked you, I think, two dozen instances in
 which you have pointed out to me the difference between the actual value or the
 rent payable by premises, and the amount of the valuation in some cases; the
 valuation is about one-half the rent?—It is.

Mr. Dennis Wolfe.

3 May 1837.

10236. In other cases, I rather think less than one-half?—Yes.

10237. And in other cases about one-third, varying from a half to a third, or thereabouts; now having stated those instances, can you have any hesitation in saying that is as incorrect a criterion of value as can be well conceived?—I do not think it can be more inaccurate than it is.

10238. Mr. Hamilton.] You have heard the other witness state there was an opportunity in 1831 and 1834 of raising the valuation?—There was.

10239. And that it was raised in some cases?—I know myself one man who improved his property, Mr. Creane, one of the commissioners; his property was improved by him, and there was a rise put on.

10240. So that, in point of fact, there was nothing to prevent the valuation being increased?—No, there was not, from all I had heard.

10241. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But was not that only where there were improvements after 1828?—Yes.

10242. Was there any instance in which the valuation of 1828 was raised, where there had been no intermediate improvement of the premises?—I heard it never was raised.

10243. Mr. Hamilton.] Can you account at all for its not being raised?—I stated here the other day the reason of it. I heard most of the commissioners say that it would cost 30 *l.* to get the town valued again, and they thought what they would make by it would not benefit the public.

10244. But without having a general valuation, could not the premises be so obviously and manifestly undervalued, as to be raised in the valuation?—I think they wanted to get every house in Clonmel valued, from what I could see or hear. I never saw the commissioners' books till I saw them here; and I must say I never saw a more incorrect valuation.

10245. Can you state, whether in Pedder's case, there was an improvement in the house?—Mr. Pedder has built a very fine house.

10246. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then his house has been improved since?—It is one of the most splendid houses in Clonmel that Mr. Pedder has.

10247. And that since 1828?—I am not sure it is, as well as I can recollect.

10248. Mr. Hamilton.] Do you recollect about the period when the improvements were made?—No, I could not state; but if you wish I will ask a person who is here, who can tell me; Mr. Keily can tell me.

10249. Chairman.] With regard to the last case of James Hackett, who was valued in the book at 5 *l.*, and you have given evidence that his rent is 10 *l.*; what are his politics?—They are decidedly liberal, and his landlord's too.

10250. Now then I ask you, with regard to the commissioners in 1834 (the new commissioners), were any of them strong party people?—The present commissioners? Yes, they are all liberal men, every man of them, with the exception of the mayor.

10251. Were any of those 21 liberal commissioners concerned in Mr. Roynay's election petition before the House of Commons, in 1833?—Yes, they were.

10252. Then they had very much the same sort of information, I presume, on the subject of the valuation, that you have detailed to the Committee?—No, I do not think they had, they did not take pains to go about; I was appointed with other persons to go about and value the houses we thought would be impugned before the Committee.

10253. Do you mean to say there is no one of those 21 liberal commissioners who were elected in 1834, that were cognizant of those receipts you have put in before the Committee?—There were several.

10254. Then if they saw those receipts, and were cognizant of those receipts, they were also cognizant of the fact of these parties being undervalued in the commissioners' books?—They were, I often heard them say.

10255. But having this information in their possession, they still did not deem it expedient to raise those persons?—That was the reason I heard for the different applications that were made.

10256. Now, in the case of Mr. Pedder, it was considered proper to raise him, was it not; they were quite right in raising him, were they not?—I do not know one halfpenny about it.

10257. Supposing him to be raised, do you know any objection to it?—The house was built new; there was no house at all on the place where it stands.

10258. You

10258. You mean to say, up to the year 1834 there was no house at all of Mr. Pedder's?—It is not in the year 1828. Mr. Dennis Wolfe

10259. There was no house of Mr. Pedder's?—I should suppose that was about the time it was built. 3 May 1837.

10260. Was there any house in the year 1831?—Yes, the present house.

10261. Well, then the house was built between 1828 and 1831?—Yes; I should suppose about 1828 the house was built.

10262. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Does he appear in the valuation of 1828?—I do not know.

10263. *Chairman.*] What I want to know is, whether you believe, from what you have heard, that Mr. Pedder's valuation was changed?—I never heard it until now; I do not know the reason why it was.

10264. Do you believe it now from what you have heard?—I think it must have been changed, from what I have heard.

10265. Where was the difficulty for the commissioners to have varied other persons' rates without valuing the whole town, when they seem to have found no difficulty in raising Mr. Pedder's valuation?—They employed, as well as I understand, an architect, Mr. Kelter, to go about, for which I believe, they gave him either 3*l.* or 5*l.*, to ascertain the houses that were improved and built; that is, as well as I recollect.

10266. To go and do what?—To go and value the houses that were improved.

10267. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then it was only the houses that were improved?—Yes.

10268. *Chairman.*] Still they did not think it their duty, although they were cognizant of the under value of particular houses from the same source of information that was brought before the Committee, they did not think it proper to raise those houses without a general valuation of the town?—That was the general idea.

10269. But that there were certain cases in which they deviated from that view of the case, and did alter the valuation?—They did so, I heard; I do not know, but as I heard, there were some alterations.

10270. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Was not that only where improvements were made?—Yes, decidedly.

10271. What street is it Mr. Pedder lives in?—He lives at a place called Gallows Hill, the upper part of Johnson-street.

10272. Mr. *Hewittou.*] When was Mr. Bagwell's petition?—It was the 16th of May 1833.

10273. Mr. *Hogg.*] Do you consider that the increases to which you have drawn the attention of the Committee, in answer to Mr. Serjeant Ball, that such increases influenced the registry-book?—I do not think it did; I think half the people that are there do not understand what they are valued at; they are called upon to pay, and they pay.

10274. Then with respect to the registry of voters by the harrister, you do not consider that these increases had any effect one way or the other?—No, indeed not; no effect at all.

10275. So that, as regards the election of members for the borough, all the increases you have spoken to are wholly immaterial?—Indeed they are.

10276. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] That is to say, do I understand you to mean, that this valuation-book was never considered by any party as a criterion of value?—Never; it was never considered so.

10277. Perhaps you can, on reference to this (here is Johnson-street), tell me whether Mr. Pedder's name appears there at all?—No.

10278. Now, James Sayer's house, do you know that, in Upper Johnson-street?—I do.

10279. Do you know the rent of that house?—£.9, as well as I recollect.

10280. Now, tell me what is the valuation of that house?—£.8.

10281. You have not the receipt for that?—I have it, but I have it not about me; I produced it the other day.

10282. Can you recollect what the rent was?—It was either 8*l.* 10*s.* or 9*l.* [The Witness referred to his book.] 9*l.*, the rent is.

Mr. Patrick J. Keily's Examination resumed.

Mr. P. J. Keily.

8 May 1837.

10283. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You have stated there was an increase of 8*l.* on the valuation of Mr. Pedder's house; was that in consequence of improvements made in Mr. Pedder's house after the valuation of 1828 was made?—It was.

10284. And is there any instance in which the valuation of any premises was raised where improvements had not been made subsequent to the valuation of 1828?—In no case.

10285. Can you state any other instance besides Mr. Pedder's, in which the valuation was raised in consequence of the improvements?—I can.

10286. What is the instance?—In Johnson-street; George Wood & Co., and several others.

10287. *Chairman.*] Well, what were they raised from, and what were they raised to?—It was valued in 1828 at 40*l.*, and valued in 1834 at 45*l.*

10288. And that was in consequence of improvements?—It was.

10289. And you state there are other instances?—There are other instances.

10290. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] I understood you to answer me, there was no case in which the valuation of the premises was raised subsequent to 1828, except where improvements had taken place in the state of the premises subsequent to that period?—Precisely so.

10291. Do you state also that there is no case in which the valuation made in 1828 was subsequently reduced, except where the premises valued in 1828 had deteriorated in value after that time?—I do, as far as my recollection goes.

10292. Then you state it to be a fact that in no instance was the valuation of 1828 subsequently reduced by reason of its having been too high in 1828?—There have been cases of that kind by reason of excessive value in 1828, and there have been cases where they have been subsequently reduced in 1831 and 1834, where there were appeals lodged.

10293. Then your answer to my former question cannot be correct, because you told me, in answer to my former question, there was no instance in which the valuation of 1828 was reduced, except where the premises had deteriorated in value subsequent to 1828; did you not tell me that?—There were some cases in 1831 and 1834, where there were appeals from the valuation made in 1831 to that time, that were reduced in point of excessive value, upon the hearing of each appeal.

10294. Will you attend to me now, then; can you state any instance in which there was an appeal in 1831 or 1834 against the valuation made in 1828, by reason of that valuation having been too high, or having been excessive when made in 1828?—Yes, there are appeals to that effect also.

10295. And not by reason of the premises having been lessened in value after the valuation in 1828 was made?—And also by reason of the premises having been lessened in value. I should observe, there are some instances of premises having deteriorated in value since 1828.

10296. Then do you adhere to this answer, namely, that there have been instances in which the valuation made in 1828 has been reduced, on the sole ground that when made in 1828 it was too high?—That was the objection contained in the appeal.

10297. And none other?—And none other.

10298. Then there have been such cases?—There have been some such cases.

10299. Are you able then to specify such cases?—I will.

10300. By reference to the appeal books?—Yes.

10301. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then be so good as do so?

Mr. Dennis Walsh's Examination resumed.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

10302. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now, you know Thomas Mackey, of White's-lane?—I do.

10303. Will you be so good as attend to this evidence of Mr. William Smith, No. 3904: "Do you know Thomas Mackey, of White's-lane?—I do. Is he a lodger?—He is a lodger; I was present at his registry. Do you know what rent he pays?—He stated his rent to be from 10*d.* to 1*s.* 2*d.*; I do not exactly know now the number of pence, but it was such an extraordinary scene to see him come forward to register that it created a sensation in court; he was cross-examined very minutely by Mr. Welch how it was that it was worth to him 10*d.* after his own admission; he stated it was worth that to him by rearing pigeons; he did not give an explanation of this, but it was generally well known that this

alluded to his keeping a house of ill fame, and the females he called pheasants and that by that means it was worth to him 10*l.* a year." Now you stated that you knew Thomas Mackey?—I do.

10304. Have you known him long?—I have, these 15 or 16 years.

10305. Is that statement, that it was generally well known in Clonmel, that he kept a house of ill fame, true or not?—It is false, inasmuch as the Roman-catholic clergymen would allow no such house to be in Clonmel.

10306. Mr. *Lefroy*.] And he never kept such a house?—Never; I do not think there is a better conducted man in Clonmel; he is a man that has a large family of female children, and such a thing as that must be highly injurious.

10307. Then do you call that palpably false?—There never was a greater falsehood.

10308. Mr. *Milnes Gaskell*.] You know he never kept such a house?—I do; he lives within 20 or 30 yards of me.

10309. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Were you by when he was registered?—I was.

10310. Can you state what took place upon the occasion of his registry?—I can; the barrister asked him how it was worth 10*l.* a year; he said, by rearing pheasants, and, says he, "Captain Morton (who was on the bench) knows."

10311. He is a magistrate?—Yes, the captain; "His honor knows how I make the rent; and I do, if he does not." In fact, he is a very great man for cock-fighting, and what he calls pheasants are the kind of cocks which are very numerous in our country, called cock pheasants.

10312. Then that part of Smith's evidence is not notoriously false, that Mackey declared he got his livelihood by rearing pheasants?—No, it is not.

10313. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] I asked whether that part of it was generally well known that alluded to his having kept a house of ill fame?—That was the part I meant; and there is another part there, that talks about lodgers; the man did not pay rent; it was a disputed property, and he was obliged to be ejected.

10314. Do you mean to say he was not a lodger?—He swore he occupied the entire premises; it was only within the last six months that he was got out at all by ejection.

10315. Mr. *Hamilton*.] He is not registered?—He was at that time. The barrister asked Mr. Welch whether he would produce any witness, and he did not. As I stated before, a good many more persons would have been rejected if there had been witnesses produced, but they did not produce them.

10316. Mr. *Hogg*.] Then the explanation of the expression of rearing pheasants, is that this man was by profession a person who fought cocks?—He went frequently down to the King and Queen's County, to Kilkenny and Waterford and fought cocks; I have known him myself go to Waterford and Kilkenny to fight cocks.

10317. What is he by trade?—He is a stonemason by trade.

10318. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Have you ever seen a pheasant, in the ordinary sense of the word, on his premises?—I have not; they are called pheasants.

10319. Mr. *Hogg*.] In your country do they call that among the most respectable professions, that of going about cock-fighting?—Some of the most respectable men in our country are cock-fighters; they hold very large bets.

10320. Then those who follow that as a trade you consider among the respectable people in Clonmel; I do not mean the higher classes, but persons in an obscure situation of life, who follow the profession of cock-fighting, do you consider them among the most respectable people of Clonmel?—No, I do not; the tradesmen in particular are very fond of cock-fighting.

10321. It does not add to the respectability of a man, I presume, in the opinion of people in his own class of life?—I do not think it does.

10322. You do not think it detracts from the respectability of a tradesman, being a professed cock-fighter?—I do not.

10323. *Chairman*.] The Roman-catholic priests have no objection to cock-fighting?—No; I never heard they had.

10324. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] But they do object to houses of ill fame?—I have known Roman-catholic clergymen object to that.

10325. *Chairman*.] Not only object to them, but prevent their existence?—They would not for 48 hours allow any such house in Clonmel. I have seen Roman-catholics before now send 25 up to the House of Industry, from a house of the kind that was kept; 25 unfortunate females. The late Mr. Chaytor gave them his assistance; he was the late mayor.

Mr. Denis Walsh.

8 May 1837.

10326. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] You do not think the inhabitants are the worse on that account?—I do not.

10327. *Chairman*.] Do you think that is the case with the Roman-catholics throughout Ireland, that they are able put down houses of that description?—I do think they are, as far as the towns I know.

10328. In all the towns, in a population of 18,000?—I do not think there is one such house now in the town of Clonmel.

10329. You think that is the case all over Ireland?—I only speak of Clonmel.

10330. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] Do you consider that an evil or a benefit, the putting down houses of ill fame?—I think it is a great benefit to society at large.

10331. So that in that respect you think the Roman-catholics have not done much mischief?—I think they have done a great deal of good.

10332. I believe after what you have stated, you are of opinion, that because a man is a cock-fighter, it does not follow he would condescend to keep a house of ill fame?—He would not; that man would not keep such a house. I have known him for 15 years.

10333. Mr. *Hogg*.] Was it stated before the registering barrister that the meaning of rearing pheasants was keeping a house of ill fame?—I never heard it.

10334. Were you present?—I was.

10335. Well, was it stated?—No, it was not.

10336. Were you present at the time?—I was present when the man registered.

10337. Were you present when he gave his evidence?—I was.

10338. And stated how he made his rent?—Yes, he did.

10339. Was there any such explanation given as to the meaning of rearing pheasants?—No, there was not; not a word about it.

10340. No explanation one way or the other?—No; he appealed to Captain Morton, who was sitting on the bench, "the Captain there knows;" and every body in court knew, because cock-fighters had those kind of birds.

10341. Does Captain Morton ever attend cock-fighting?—I have heard he does.

10342. *Chairman*.] Was the registering harrister fond of cock-fighting?—I cannot say.

10343. Of course he understood, that when the person said he got his living by rearing pheasants, that those pheasants meant fighting-cocks?—That is what I heard persons say.

10344. That is what the harrister understood it to be?—I should suppose so.

10345. Mr. *Hogg*.] Then there was no explanation; the registering barrister asked none?—No; he was asked by Mr. Welch what was the value of his premises, and he swore they were to him worth 10*l.*, and Mr. Welch in cross-examining him called upon him to produce a witness, and he declined, and the harrister said he would take any man's oath in preference to assertion.

10346. The counsel employed by Mr. Bagwell asked no explanation of his meaning?—No, not one word; he said, he would take any man's oath in preference to the assertion of an unsworn person.

10347. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] Do you consider it could have been at all material whether it was pheasants or cock pheasants reared, provided he made 10*l.* a year; that was his case?—Yes.

10348. Could it have made the slightest difference whether it was pheasants be reared, provided he made 10*l.* a year by them, or what you call cock pheasants?—Not the least.

10349. And therefore so far there was no explanation wanted?—No.

10350. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Would it have made any difference if it were pheasants in the other sense of the word?—I do not think it would.

10351. *Chairman*.] Would it make any difference in the belief that ought to be given to a man's oath, if he swore he reared pheasants, when he had not any such thing on his premises?—That is what they are called; there are in the neighbourhood of the Marquis of Waterford's a great number of those pheasants, and they call them all pheasants.

10352. That is no answer to my question; my question was, "Would it make any difference as to the credence to be given to a man who swore he bred up pheasants, in the ordinary acceptation of the word, when such pheasants never

were

were on his premises?—I think if he understood they were pheasants it would make a very serious difference; but as I stated before, they are all called pheasants with us down in our country.

10353. When you are talking of other pheasants, how do you designate them?—I do not think he intended to deceive the barrister.

10354. When you are talking of other pheasants, how do you designate them; what we call in England, "pheasants"?—Pheasants, they call them; they are called by the very same name.

10355. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] I believe pheasants, as they are called in England, are not much known in Ireland?—Very little; I do not think there is one nearer to Clonmel than the Marquis of Waterford's, which is 18 or 20 miles off.

10356. Mr. Hogg.] Were you ever in this man's premises?—I was.

10357. Did you ever see any pheasants in his house?—No, I did not; I was not inside; I went to the door at the time of the first election.

10358. Mr. Milnes Gaskell.] You never saw any cocks in his premises?—No.

10359. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But do you know for a fact that he was in the habit of keeping what are called cock pheasants?—I know he was in the habit of going down to the King's and Queen's County.

10360. Mr. Hogg.] That is not the question; did you ever see any pheasants or cocks inside his dwelling, on those premises?—No, I did not; I am not very fond of cock-fighting.

10361. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] How often have you been on his premises?—I only went in the year 1832, at the time of the first election of Mr. Romayne.

10362. Then I presume, for aught you know, he may have had pheasants and cock pheasants, and all the birds of the air on his premises?—He may; I never was inside his house.

10363. Now, there being no pheasants, properly so called, in that part of the country, is it the fact that when people talk of pheasants (the class of people to which you are alluding) they mean cock pheasants?—They are the only ones we have.

10364. And, accordingly, when they talk of pheasants, they mean fighting-cocks?—Yes; there are two or three descriptions of cocks; there are game cocks, and there is what they call a cross between pheasants and game cocks; they call them pheasants.

10365. So that they are crossed by pheasants?—Yes.

10366. Mr. Milnes Gaskell.] If a man were going to a cock-fight, then would he say he was going to a pheasant-fight?—No, I do not suppose he would.

10367. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Because they might be game cocks?—Yes.

10368. So that it does not necessarily follow that he was going to a pheasant-fight because he was going to a cock-fight?—No.

10369. Then the generic term is cock-fighting, and the particular species are pheasant cocks, game cocks, and what else is there, any other kind?—There is Muscovy cocks.

10370. Mr. Lefroy.] If you were so well acquainted with this person's character, how came it that you never set foot in his house during the long time you were acquainted with him?—I had no business there.

10371. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You had no occasion to build a house, and did not want a stonemason?—No; I had no occasion to go there.

10372. And you had no occasion to fight cocks; you did not want a cock-fight?—No.

10373. And, accordingly, there being no common relation between you, you had no occasion to pay visits to him?—No, I never saw a cock-fight yet.

10374. I think you stated he had a family?—He has daughters; his wife and daughters.

10375. How many daughters?—Either two or three.

10376. And do they live with him?—They do.

10377. And his wife?—And his wife.

10378. Chairwoman.] Are the daughters married or unmarried?—I think one of his daughters is married.

10379. What are their ages?—They are young women; I should suppose about 20 or 22.

10380. They are grown up, I mean?—They are.

10381. Mr. Milnes Gaskell.] There are no other women in the house?—There are a great many in the lane; several persons living down the lane.

Mr. Dennis Falcke.
8 May 1837.

10382. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] But in the house?—I do not know; I was not in.
10383. Mr. *Hogg*.] Do you know whether there are or not any other women in the house?—I do not.

10384. You cannot state the fact one way or the other?—I cannot.
10385. Mr. *Milnes Gaskell*.] Did you ever hear that there were any other women living in the house with him besides his wife and his daughters?—No, I did not.

10386. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] But you are quite certain he could not have kept a house of ill fame in Clonmel without your knowledge?—He could not.

10387. *Chairman*.] Did he let out lodgings?—I do not know whether he did or not.

10388. What was the size of his house?—It was a small house.
10389. Are there more than two rooms in it?—I do not know, indeed; I was not inside.

10390. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Is then the certainty which you have expressed with respect to there not being those kind of houses in Clonmel, derived from your opinion that the Roman-catholic clergymen would not allow them, or from actual knowledge?—If the Roman-catholic clergymen heard there was such a house in the town, they would give warning on one Sunday that if they do not quit the town by the Sunday following, or give it up, that they would call their names from the altar on the Sunday following.

10391. Mr. *Lefroy*.] How is it that they have an opportunity of learning whether there are such houses?—Any well-conducted person, knowing there were such houses in the town, would immediately go and give the clergymen information.

10392. *Chairman*.] By their calling the names from the altar, do you mean excommunicating them?—No, I do not say that. I think they would apply to the chief magistrate, the mayor, and get them committed to the workhouse; and I have known several of them to give them up, and become very proper characters afterwards.

10393. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] What, that have become reformed?—Yes.
10394. Mr. *Hogg*.] Are we to understand you as positively stating the fact, that there is not at this present moment a house of ill fame in the town of Clonmel?—I do not think there is one house of ill fame in the town of Clonmel, not that is publicly known; I do not think there is one in the town. The clergymen there are very vigilant.

10395. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] Now be so good as attend to this evidence of Mr. George Graham, No. 5343: "Do you consider the circumstance of a house having become the resort for some years of persons who want to get lines mangled, having become the resort of those persons, having got a name for mangling, that that constitutes any additional value to the house if taken by a person who does not go into the same line of trade?—I doubt it, if it was in Clonmel. If it was in London or Dublin, or a large city, I think it might have some effect on the establishment; but in Clonmel, I do not conceive that any branch of business that I know of can be worth 5*l.* in addition. What I mean to say is, that supposing any shopkeeper in Clonmel moved out of the house he was now in, well established, and a good business, if he moved to any other part of Clonmel, he would do as well; that he would not leave any particular value after him in that business he left. But, suppose a shopkeeper in extensive business to-day, his shop the resort of country people coming in on market-days, do you mean to say there would be no additional value acquired by that house from the circumstance of his having carried on a prosperous and extensive trade there for several years, and that a future occupier would not be disposed to give more for the house if he meant to go into the same line of business in the house so occupied?—The future occupier very likely would prefer a place occupied in a similar line. Would he not give more?—I should think he would. Then that would constitute some additional value?—That would constitute some additional value, but that difference is very little with the humbler class of dwellings. Then it is your opinion that a house acquires additional value from having been a place where a prosperous and extensive trade has been carried on for some time?—Yes; but as I have already remarked, in reply to a question, I do not think, in the best establishment in Clonmel, that it would make a difference of 5*l.* a year in the value. To whom?—To the first class of houses in Clonmel, for another person succeeding in a similar line of business. That is to say,

8 May 1837.

say, is it your opinion that if the most extensive and the most prosperous shopkeeper in Clonmel were to die to-morrow, and if his house was to be let to another occupier, and if that occupier meant to go into the same line of business precisely as his predecessor, that the new occupier would not give more than 5*l.* a year additional for the advantage he would acquire by succeeding the former occupier in the same premises?—I do not think that an individual would give half that sum, except for the sake of the fittings that there may be in the shop. Do you mean for the goodwill of the trade?—Yes. It is your judgment therefore that the goodwill of the most prosperous trade in Clonmel is not worth to any man 5*l.* a year, is that your judgment, in one house more than another?—Yes, it is. In order to illustrate it, I put the case distinctly of a man either dying or giving up the trade, to be the most prosperous shopkeeper, dying or leaving the trade; your opinion is, that if he came to let his house to a person succeeding him in the same trade, that person would not give as much as 5*l.* a year additional for getting into those premises, instead of setting up business in premises which had never been occupied in that line before?—Not more than the intrinsic value of the premises themselves, independent of that line of business. Then he would not give 5*l.* a year more for premises in which he may have succeeded the former occupier, than he would for premises in which he began trade for the first time?—I cannot say what another might do, but I would not. But what is your opinion of people?—My opinion is, they would not, people generally. Does it not follow from that, that the goodwill of the most prosperous trade in Clonmel is not worth to any man 5*l.* a year; you see what I mean by the goodwill?—Yes; that is, carrying on a particular establishment. That it is not worth 5*l.* a year?—Not a particular establishment, a particular house; that is the impression on my mind. Now, what do you mean by goodwill?—What I understand from the gentleman who examined me is, a particular interest arising from a particular class of customers frequenting that one establishment. Do you mean to say that the goodwill of a firm or a trade or a shopkeeper may not be independent of the particular house in which he resides?—Not in Clonmel; in larger places it would: in London it would, in Dublin it would make a material difference, and in Cork and in Limerick; the more you get down to small towns in our country the less value in the south of Ireland. My question is, may not the goodwill of a trade be independent of the particular house in which it is carried on?—I think so. Then I understand you to say, that that would be the case in London, Dublin or Cork, but not so in Clonmel?—No. My question is, supposing a linendraper to live at No. 6, Main-street, Clonmel, and he wishes to sell his trade to another party (the goodwill of that trade), that other party living in No. 7, would that make any difference as to the value of the goodwill, the moving from the one place to the other?—I do not think it would make any difference. Is not the goodwill of a trade generally understood to be the advantage of obtaining the same customers as the party selling that goodwill has heretofore had?—So I understand. And is not that, the goodwill, then distinct from the house in which the individual has been carrying on his trade?—Distinct from the house in large places, where the individual is not known, but the number and the particular position of the concern, then it may constitute a value upon a house; if you see number such a place, without knowing the person or the occupier, then you go to such a number to buy goods, in that case I think it constitutes a separate value on the house; but when you go to a person and know the person, which is the case in all the small towns I am acquainted with, if that person moves into another corner of the town or street he does just as much business in his establishment there as the one he left, and the one that he left is of no more value, so that the goodwill follows the individual. I am putting the case in which the individual was supposed to give up trade or died, then that trade must either remain where it was before or it must go elsewhere; now I ask you, do not you consider it would remain, in the case I put of the man dying or giving up trade, that it would remain, in the premises where it was originally formed?—I do not think it would. And you do not think a single customer would be inclined to remain?—I do not say that; there may be some exceptions. But I understand you to speak generally?—I do. Then do you conceive that some customers would remain merely through love of the premises?—I doubt if one would through love of the premises. Then do you believe any customer would be likely to remain?—Not through love of the premises. Through any motive?—Except some motives might arise with respect to the individual that came to occupy it; except

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

8 May 1837.

they found that they had derived advantage by dealing at that establishment." Then at No. 5377, he is asked, "But do you still adhere to the opinion that it is not worth 5*l.* in any instance in Clonmel?—Undoubtedly I do." Now having heard that evidence, Mr. Walsh, I ask you whether you concur in opinion with Mr. George Graham, that the goodwill of the most prosperous establishment in Clonmel is not worth 5*l.* a year?—I do not.

10396. You are in trade yourself?—I am.

10397. In Clonmel?—Yes.

10398. Do you consider that there is any such thing in Clonmel as the goodwill of a trade; that there is any such thing as the goodwill of a trade?—There is.

10399. Do you mean, by that answer, that when an establishment is formed in Clonmel, the premises in which that establishment is carried on acquire some additional value from that circumstance?—I do; that is the circumstance.

10400. That is to say, do I understand you to mean, that when an establishment is once formed, and the person who has formed it, gets rid of it, dies or retires from trade, and sells his premises, that he would be likely to get some additional price from a person who meant to continue the same trade, by reason of the continuance, or the assumed continuance of the goodwill of the trade in the same establishment?—I do.

10401. Now have you any reason, within your own experience, for being able to form an estimate of the value of that goodwill?—I have.

10402. In the premises you now occupy, did you not succeed some other person?—I did.

10403. Who was that other person?—Richard Kennedy, a grocer.

10404. Had he formed an establishment in your premises?—He had.

10405. Had he been long resident there?—The house was in the same business for the last 30 years.

10406. When did you take it, about?—About this time 12 months.

10407. You purchased the premises, the tenant's interest?—I did.

10408. Did you pay any fine?—I did.

10409. Now I wish to know whether you paid that fine, or any portion of it, in consideration of there having been an establishment formed in that house before you came there?—I paid 50 guineas.

10410. Do you mean to state to the Committee you paid that 50 guineas in consideration of there having been an establishment on the premises before?—For that, and that alone.

10411. Then in that instance, I am to understand you to state, that in your estimation the goodwill of that trade was worth to you 50 guineas?—It was.

10412. Then, it is not the fact, in your judgment, that the goodwill of the most prosperous trade in Clonmel is not worth more than 5*l.* a year?—I know one house that they were endeavouring to sell the goodwill of, some time within the last six months, and they wanted 3,500*l.* for the goodwill of it.

10413. What house is that?—Mr. Murray's spirit stores.

10414. Then this tale about the goodwill of the most prosperous trade in Clonmel not being worth more than 5*l.* a year appears to be quite fanciful?—It is a most serious mistake of Mr. Graham's.

10415. Mr. Hogg.] Is Mr. Kennedy alive?—He got deranged.

10416. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Was obliged to give up trade?—Yes.

10417. Mr. Hogg.] Were you a partner?—No; I have a partner in my spirit trade.

10418. You bought Kennedy's stock in trade?—I purchased the goodwill of the house; he had no stock, not worth talking of; I purchased the vessels from him for 50 guineas, and he was obliged to pay a fine himself.

10419. What was the lease in the premises?—I think 25 years.

10420. And you purchased the 25 years' lease?—I did; I was promised it, but I did not get it; I have not got it yet.

10421. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You mean it has 25 years to run?—Yes; I did not get an assignment of it.

10422. Mr. Hogg.] But you are to get it; you bought it?—Yes.

10423. You yourself purchased it?—Yes.

10424. He was a grocer?—He was.

10425. I presume you purchased his stock of groceries?—He had none; I purchased some vessels that he had.

10426. He had no groceries?—I suppose he had not 10*l.* worth.

10427. He

10427. He had no groceries, and you gave 50 guineas for the purchase of the goodwill of a grocer so reduced that he had no groceries?—I did; but the man had a good deal of money, but he got deranged, and for five or six months before that he was getting out of the business.

10428. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Then Kennedy had no groceries at the time you became the purchaser?—No.

10429. That is to say, he had sold them out?—Yes.

10430. Mr. *Hogg.*] And you are to get his 25 years' lease?—I am.

10431. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] But you are quite clear you would not have given that 50 guineas, or any portion of it, for the 25 years' lease, if there had not been, previously to your purchasing it, a grocery establishment there?—I would not. He paid himself 20 guineas, and was obliged to put a new front before he got it from the person whom he succeeded.

10432. Then there had been a grocery establishment there before he took the premises?—Yes.

10433. And he paid himself 20 guineas for the goodwill of that business?—Yes, and was obliged to put a new front besides.

10434. And when you purchased the establishment, and gave 50 guineas for it, you thought it worth it?—I have no doubt if the same establishment were disposed of to-morrow, I would get 100 guineas for the goodwill of it.

10435. Then it is improved since you went into it?—It is.

10436. Mr. *Hogg.*] He built a new front to the house after he had it?—Yes, he was bound by the agreement he made to put a new front, and pay a fine of 20*l.*; and he put a new front, and before I got it, I was obliged to pay the price of the front, besides the 50 guineas.

10437. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Then there is such a thing in Clonmel as the intrinsic value of a house being enhanced by something independent of the brick and mortar, and other materials of which it is composed?—Certainly. There is a part of Clonmel where I would get as good a house as the one I have for 20 guineas a year.

10438. Situation is one ingredient?—Yes.

10439. But there is also the custom of the establishment or the goodwill in the house?—There is.

10440. *Chairman.*] I think you said you gave 50 guineas for your goodwill?—Yes.

10441. And where do you live?—In the Main-street.

10442. Is that a better street than Johnson-street?—It is the best street in Clonmel.

10443. What is the difference in the value of a house between Main-street and Johnson-street?—There are some houses in Johnson-street as large as mine set for 30*l.* a year.

10444. And what is yours?—*£.* 55.

10445. Then do you mean to say you think you give too much rent, or that they give too little?—No; you must pay for the situation.

10446. Now, supposing you took your business to Johnson-street, and left your house in the Main-street, what do you think you could sell your goodwill for in that Main-street house?—I would not take a present of any house in Johnson-street to commence business. I would rather pay the rent I pay than get a present of a house in Johnson-street.

10447. What part of Main-street do you live in?—No. 100, Main-street.

10448. Now, supposing you took a house, No. 50, and wished to dispose of the goodwill of your trade at No. 100, do you think you would get a great deal of the same trade at No. 50?—I would not. I would rather pay double the rent where I am than remove into any other part of the town, for it is one of the oldest establishments in Clonmel.

10449. And you do not think you could carry the trade with you to No. 50?—I do not think I should have as good a trade as I have there.

10450. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] So that the goodwill is likely to remain with the premises?—It is.

10451. *Chairman.*] How long have you been in that house?—About 12 months.

10452. How long had the party of whom you purchased the goodwill been in the house?—The grocery business has been carried on in that house for the last 40 years.

10453. How long had the party immediately preceding you been in that house?—I cannot say whether it was 18 months or two years; I know for six months he was deranged before he left.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

8 May 1837.

10454. How long had the party of whom he purchased been there?—That man lived there upwards of 30 years, and made some thousands of pounds there.
10455. Supposing he had wished to transfer his business to another house in that street, 20 or 30 doors off, what effect do you think that would have had on his business?—I think it would have had a very serious effect.
10456. How much?—I cannot exactly say; but I know some customers who were in the habit of going into that house that would not follow him; some may.
10457. Supposing the house No. 100 to be shut up, and the person who had been there for 30 years in the grocery line transferred his business and his residence to 40 or 50 doors off, do you mean to say they would not follow him there?—I do not think they would; I think if the house were opened 12 months after a great many customers would come back again.
10458. After having been shut up six or nine months, you think they would have still reverted to that house?—I think they would.
10459. Is your business chiefly with town or country people?—Both town and country.
10460. Are there weekly markets there?—There are two market-days a week, and 12 fairs in the year.
10461. Mr. Hogg.] Main-street, I understand you to say, is by much the best situation for trade?—It is.
10462. So much so, that I think you said you would rather give 50*l.* a year for a house situated in Main-street, as regards trade, than give 25*l.* or 30*l.* for one in Johnson-street?—I would rather pay 55*l.* in the house I am in than take a present of any house in Johnson-street, from the third or fourth door.
10463. So well calculated for business is Main-street, as regards situation?—It is.
10464. Is it a large street, Main-street?—It is very large.
10465. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then I think I understand you to mean this: that what I may call the intrinsic value of a house in Clonmel is enhanced by reason of an establishment for trade having been formed there?—Decidedly; but there is as good a house as mine in Irishtown, and the person has it for 20*l.* a year; it is fully as good as mine, and I am paying 55*l.* for mine.
10466. And you consider that the increased rent that you pay is owing, in a more or less degree, to the circumstance of there being an establishment in the grocery trade formed there?—Yes, and the situation being better.
10467. But independent of situation?—I do, from persons residing so long in it, and being a house where there was a great deal of business done.
10468. So that you have no doubt, in practice, that persons taking houses in Clonmel, purchasing the tenants' interest, they take into account the circumstance of an establishment having been formed there in the line of trade they mean to go into, and that they give a higher price for the house by reason of that establishment having been so formed?—They certainly do; I know another young man who gave 25*l.* two or three days before I came over for the goodwill of an establishment.
10469. Mr. Hogg.] You stated the stock was entirely exhausted; I asked you if you bought the stock of groceries, and you told me there was nothing to buy?—I suppose there was not more than 10*l.* worth of groceries, but they were selling off six months before.
10470. And for five or six months the man had been deranged, the stock exhausted, and, I presume, the customers going elsewhere?—I dare say they might have been.
10471. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Was he out of trade five or six months before you purchased it?—No.
10472. Was he out of trade at all?—No.
10473. They were continuing the business?—Yes.
10474. And they were selling off the stock?—Yes.
10475. Then when you spoke of having given that 50 guineas for the goodwill, you mean having given that for the advantage of the customers continuing to go there?—Yes; I considered that in the fine, and the large rent that I pay.
10476. Chaireson.] Had they been selling off their stock at rather a low rate?—I cannot say.
10477. Did you not ask that question?—I did not.
10478. Do you apply the same observation with regard to houses of small value, that you do with regard to houses of large value?—Some houses do not pay so much, but my house is the principal house in Main-street: if there are any

any houses to be set, they must pay fines for them in Main-street and Dublin-street; in Irishtown they do not pay fines.

10479. Do you apply the principle you have laid down with regard to this house, to houses of a small value?—I do; I know some cellars where they got 5*l.*, 8*l.*, and 10*l.* for the goodwill, persons leaving.

10480. Mr. O'Connell.] The Main-street runs from the gateway to the market-house?—It does, not further; that is the Main-street.

10481. Chairman.] And Dublin-street is a continuation from Market-place?—Yes.

10482. What is Johnson-street, Upper or Lower, is that at right angles with Main-street?—It is at right angles with Main-street.

10483. And does that branch into the market-place?—It does; Johnson-street, with the exception of the first two or three houses, is more calculated for inns and carmen's stages, than any other business; eating-houses.

10484. Mr. Hogg.] If an established grocer in Johnson-street wanted to sell his trade, would he get much for it?—I do not think he would get 1*s.* for it.

10485. If an established grocer in Johnson-street wanted to sell his trade, you do not think he would get 1*s.* for it?—Generally speaking, there are only two houses there, grocers.

10486. I understand from that, that in Clonmel, situation, as regards trade, is everything?—It is.

10487. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] And is it not so in every other town?—I should think it was.

10488. Suppose a grocer to set up an establishment five miles from Clonmel, where there is no village about him, do you think he would get anything for that?—No.

10489. In the same way, if he sets up an establishment in a part of the town which is not the resort of customers, he would get nothing for that either?—No.

10490. And therefore, in order that an establishment should be of any value, it must be, in point of situation, in that part of the town to which customers resort?—Of course; if I were made a present of a house in Irishtown or Johnson-street, I would not take it.

10491. Mr. O'Connell.] What do you call the Irishtown?—From the gate to the House of Industry.

10492. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Now, you have given me some answers respecting Macker; there is another man alluded to I find, which it is quite right we should hear something about, if you know anything on the subject; this is the evidence of Mr. Richard Legge, (4602): "Now, as to Denis Slattery of Johnson-street?—I know the house that he registered out of; I did not go to examine it, but I went by his evidence, his own statement at the registry. What was the nature of his evidence at the registry?—He said he had a room in Mrs. Comerford's house. Were you present at the registry of Denis Slattery?—I was." Now, does your recollection of what occurred correspond with that statement?—It does not.

10493. Will you state what, according to your recollection, occurred upon that occasion?—He said that he carried on business in the house of Mrs. Comerford, of Johnson-street, and Mr. Guthrie asked him whether he had the exclusive right to the hall-door, he said he had. He asked him, was it worth 10*l.*; he said, "it is worth to me 10*l.*" Mr. Welch cross-examined him, and as he was going on Mr. Guthrie called on him to call a witness, and he declined; and he registered him.

10494. There was no witness called?—No, there was not.

10495. Now with respect to this same person, in Mr. William Smith's Evidence, No. 3968, these questions are asked: "Can you state the circumstance of Denis Slattery, of Johnson-street?—Yes, he was a lodger in a house belonging to a Mrs. Comerford, and he was asked with respect to the rent, and he stated he paid no rent; and he was asked, did he give any other compensation, and he would not tell; he said there was something 'incontinent,' but he meant something 'inconsistent,' and I will not tell you. What is Denis Slattery by trade?—I do not know what he is by trade. What is Joseph Burke by trade?—He was a clerk to the forage contractor for the county. Does he still live in Clonmel?—No, he does not; he is gone. Did Denis Slattery, on his examination, swear his interest to be worth 10*l.* a year?—He did. What was the objection to his vote?—That he was a lodger, not a householder; he took a room; the room was furnished for him; but there was something between the

Mr. Dennis Falshe.

8 May 1837.

woman and him, and he would give no sort of evidence about it. He admitted he paid no rent?—Yes. And he occupied only one room?—Occupied a room. He was admitted notwithstanding?—He was.—That is a very highly respectable woman, Mrs. Comerford; very respectable indeed.

10496. Now is it your recollection, that anything occurred that would warrant the insinuation contained in the evidence of Mr. Smith and Mr. Legge respecting this lady?—No.

10497. Did anything whatever occur?—No, indeed.

10498. *Chairman.*] Now with regard to Denis Slattery; was he not a householder?—I do not know; I was by when he swore he had the exclusive right to the hall-door, and that it was worth to him 10*l.*

10499. Do you know whether he was a lodger then or a householder?—I do not.

10500. You know nothing at all but what he swore?—No.

10501. Can you affirm positively that he did not make the mistake as to the word "inconsistent"?—He did not; I dare say there were other people there who will be examined.

10502. Then when two persons positively assert that he did make that mistake, you contradict it?—I as positively assert that he did not.

10503. But whether or no he was a lodger, you do not pretend to say?—I do not know; I know I was very often there, and always persons who admitted they were lodgers Mr. Guthrie rejected; I saw him reject them; I was by when he rejected the late Mr. Close.

10504. Who did Slattery vote for?—Slattery voted for the late Mr. Ronayne twice.

10505. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Did you add, he has left the premises?—Yes, he has left the premises.

10506. *Chairman.*] Do you know whether he was objected to in the petition against Mr. Ronayne's first return?—He was; there were persons objected to that were paying 50*l.* a year rent at that time.

10507. I only wanted to know whether he was or not?—Yes.

10508. And you came over to support Mr. Ronayne's return?—I did.

10509. As one of his witnesses?—I did.

10510. And you made up inquiry of this man as to whether or not he was a lodger?—No.

10511. And you are not aware what evidence there was to disprove his being a lodger?—I am not.

10512. Beyond his own oath?—No.

10513. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] There was no evidence given?—No; the barrister called on Mr. Welch to produce evidence, and I heard him say, at different times, to Mr. Welch, he knew no party; he would always take the man's oath in preference to the assertion of any man, and he called on Mr. Welch to produce evidence; and when evidence was produced, I saw him reject several.

10514. *Mr. O'Connell.*] Do you consider a man a lodger who has the separate or exclusive use of the outer door?—I do not.

10515. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] And you state positively, that in no instance within your observation did Mr. Guthrie allow any man to register who was occupying only a part of the premises, and had not the exclusive use of the outer door?—He did not; he always put that to them, as often as I was in, and I was very often there.

10516. *Chairman.*] What was the ground of objection to this individual before that committee, do you know?—I do not.

10517. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Now, with respect to the rent paid by persons who came to register, are you aware that claimants were registered both by Mr. Hobson and by Mr. Howley, whose rent did not amount to 10*l.* a year?—I am; I know several.

10518. Whose rent did not amount to over 6*l.* or 7*l.* a year?—2*l.* 6*s.* or 7*l.* or 8*l.*; I know several.

10519. And do you know it was the common practice for voters to register whose rent did not amount to more than 6*l.*, 7*l.* or 8*l.* a year, when, from other evidence, they were satisfied the value of the premises was 10*l.*?—It was. There was one street in particular that I knew, that is New-street; one side entirely belongs to Thomas Taylor, the Quaker, and the tenants that are there are only tenants from year to year, and they pay but 8*l.*, and yet they were registered both by Mr. Hobson, Mr. Howley and Mr. Guthrie; and Mr. Taylor could as easily get 10*l.* as he got 8*l.* for them.

10520. Can you mention any instance of tenants paying less than 8*l.*?—*Mr. Dennis Walsh.*
I can.

10521. Who are they?—One man, named Holmes, I heard paid but four guineas, and he was registered.

10522. Who registered him?—Mr. Hobson.

10523. Then he was satisfied by evidence, although his rent was only four guineas?—It is since raised to 8*l.*, and the house was very well worth 10*l.*

10524. It is raised, since the registry, to 8*l.*?—Yes.

10525. Why, then, the result of your evidence is this, that neither the valuation made in 1828 nor the amount of rent paid by the claimants for their premises were deemed by any of the registering barristers as the criterion of the value of the house?—It was not; as I stated before, there are several houses belonging to Mr. Jones and Mr. Morton; I know Mr. Morton to be getting but 8*l.* for houses he could easily get 12*l.* for.

10526. Then if that be so, the statement which I believe I read before of Mr. Higgins, that in Clonmel premises were set for the extreme value, is unfounded?—It is; I have given the names, and it is very easy to bear from the landlords in Clonmel that they are getting such and such rents; there was a Mr. King, one of his tenants, was registered by Mr. Howley, and he was only paying 8*l.*

10527. Then will you attend to this question and answer in Mr. Higgins' evidence, No. 2907: "Then rent and value, in your opinion, are synonymous?—I speak with respect to Clonmel." Now you say you know several instances where the rent payable by the persons who came to register, as well by Mr. Hobson and by Howley, and by Mr. Guthrie, was considerably under 10*l.*, and yet all three concurred in not deeming rent and value to be synonymous, but in estimating the premises worth 10*l.*, although the rent was considerably below it?—You have not said one word about any of the names being there as being objected to by either Mr. Higgins, Mr. Smith or Mr. Legge; they are not paying more than 8*l.*, any one of them, and they were registered. They were not objected to by Mr. Smith, Mr. Legge and Mr. Higgins; of course they did consider them good value for 10*l.* though they paid but 8*l.*

10528. *Chairman.*] Was there a greater anxiety, on the part of persons holding small houses, to establish the value of those houses up to 10*l.* after the Reform Bill than before?—I do not know; I think the houses in New-street were set long before the Reform Bill.

10529. Do you think or not think that there was any anxiety on the part of persons inhabiting houses to raise them to the value of 10*l.* after the Reform Bill?—I do not think there was.

10530. What, you think they did not care about the franchises?—Indeed it is very hard to bring the lower orders to register at all.

10531. Then you mean to say they did not care about the right of voting?—I do not think they did; it is very hard to get the humbler tradesmen to go forward at all to register.

10532. They had a great disinclination to have the right of voting?—Generally speaking, they had; they did not want to be bothered at all.

10533. They would rather have their houses rated low to the commissioners' rates than high for the purpose of voting?—Indeed I think they would.

10534. Though one is a greater practical benefit to them than the other?—Of course it is. Some of them have made a good deal of money during the two last contests.

10535. But I say it is a greater practical advantage to them, being rated low in the commissioners' books, than being put on the registry, and so enabling them to vote for Members of Parliament?—Yes; those that vote for the popular candidate never make anything; but the other side, I know some myself that have got 20*l.*, some poor tradesmen, at the late election.

10536. That is the general character, is it, of the constituency?—They were all tradesmen, or generally, that were bought, such as publicans and persons; they were all tradesmen, those persons that were bribed; publicans and persons.

10537. How many were bought altogether?—I do not think there were three persons in Clonmel who voted for Mr. Bagwell, except those that were bribed; there might be three or four.

10538. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] What class of people do you mean?—Publicans.

10539. How many do you suppose of those that voted for Mr. Bagwell were bribed?—I think there were 46, and there must have been over 40 of them bribed; and there were other persons, more respectable than them, that thought

0.39. Mr. Bagwell,

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

Mr. Bagwell, when he came of age, by voting for him, would give them land for building on.

10540. So that they intended to be bribed, but they were not?—Several of them got promises; I heard them say so.

10541. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] When you say 40 out of 46 were bribed, do you mean bribed with money or money's worth?—The greater part money and premises, and other things; ground.

10542. That is to say, either with money or money's worth?—Yes, money's worth, of course.

10543. *Chairman.*] Now have you stated to the Committee all the cases of persons who hold houses under the value of 10 *l.*, but still on the registry?—I think, as near as I can, I think there are about 24.

10544. Are you quite sure there are not more than that?—I do not think there are; if there are, there cannot be more than one or two; but I think there are 24 householders on the poll that ought not to be on it.

10545. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] By reason of insufficient value?—Yes.

10546. Now, you mentioned the case of Thomas Holmes, I think, who paid but four guineas?—Yes.

10547. Do you remember the case of John O'Brien?—I do.

10548. I believe he pays but 6 *l.* a year?—He pays the Rev. Mr. Morton but 6 *l.*

10549. What do you take to be the value of his premises?—He laid out some money upon it, I dare say from 80 *l.* to 100 *l.*; but the house is worth 15 *l.* or 16 *l.* a year.

10550. Was it worth that in 1828?—No, it was not.

10551. Thomas Kennedy, Irishtown; do you know his premises?—I do.

10552. I believe he only pays 8 *l.* a year?—He only pays 8 *l.* a year.

10553. What do you take to be the value of his?—I am quite sure he could get at this moment 13 *l.* a year for them, though he is only a tenant at will; it is next door to Holmes's.

10554. Do you know Walter Conway, occupying a cellar under Mr. Hogan, in the Main-street?—I do.

10555. Do you know what rent he pays?—But 7 *l.*

10556. And I believe he was registered by Mr. Howley?—He was; his landlord swore he refused 10 *l.* a year for it, and a year's rent in advance.

10557. And therefore you have no hesitation about his premises being worth 10 *l.*, though he pays but 7 *l.*?—No, no hesitation at all; Mr. Howley called on the other gentleman, when they were opposing him, to bring forward a witness, but he could not; the landlord was there, and he swore he could get 10 *l.* a year for it, though he gave it to this man for 7 *l.*

10558. Do you know where the following gentlemen reside: Jonas Shaw?—In Clonmel.

10559. Do you mean within or without the limits of the borough?—Within.

10560. The Rev. Robert Bell?—Within the borough.

10561. Hill Harvey?—He lived at Portlaw before the late election; he lives now in Ballybeg.

10562. Do you know when he became a freeman?—It was a little before 1835.

10563. Where did he reside then?—He lived out at Lohoch.

10564. I believe that is out of the limits of the borough?—It is.

10565. Considerably?—Yes.

10566. So that he was a non-resident at the time he was made a freeman?—He was; he lived 16 miles off, and came and voted.

10567. Did you know Edward Kellest?—Yes.

10568. Where did he live?—At Killencodey he lived; he is dead since.

10569. William Perry?—He lives about 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ miles from Clonmel.

10570. And that is out of the limits of the borough?—It is.

10571. And he resided there when he became a freeman?—He did.

10572. Richard Moore?—Outside of the limits of the borough also.

10573. Summerhill?—Yes.

10574. Richard Pennefather; he also resided without the limits of the borough when he became a freeman?—Yes.

10575. William Quin?—I believe over seven miles from Clonmel.

10576. And lived there when he was made a freeman?—Yes.

10577. Stephen Moore, junior?—He lived four miles or three miles and a half from Clonmel when he became a freeman.

10578. Phiness Riall?—Without the limits of the borough.
 10579. John Farrell?—Without the limits.
 10580. James and Ambrose Going?—They were rejected first by Mr. Hobson, and admitted afterwards.
 10581. Well, Edward Power?—He was admitted by Mr. Hobson.
 10582. But where did he reside?—Within the borough.
 10583. Robert Strangman?—He lived within the borough when he was registered.
 10584. Well, in what right, do you happen to know?—He lived as clerk with Mr. Malcomson.
 10585. In what right was he admitted freeman?—In right of servitude.
 10586. Jonas Shaw; do you know in what right he was admitted?—Living clerk to Mr. Malcomson.
 10587. Robert Howell?—He lived within the borough when he was admitted.
 10588. But in what right was he admitted a freeman?—I heard him swear he lived as clerk to Morton & Grubb.
 10589. And he was admitted a freeman in right of servitude?—Yes, I was by when the late Mr. Ronayne asked him, "Was there ever an indenture;" he said not; "and you are on a salary; you are head clerk with a salary;" he said he lived three years and a half clerk to Morton & Grubb.
 10590. The Reverend Robert Bell; do you know in what right he was admitted?—
 10591. *Chairman.*] Who is the harrister you are talking of, when this conversation took place?—The late Mr. Hobson; all those were registered by the late Mr. Hobson.
 10592. Robert Howell was the last name?—He was registered by the late Mr. Hobson.
 10593. The Rev. Robert Bell; do you know in what right he was admitted a freeman?—In right of marriage.
 10594. Having married the daughter of a freeman?—Yes.
 10595. And is that the fact?—I do not know; but, however, he got his freedom free of trade, so I understood.

The Examination of Mr. Patrick J. Keily resumed.

10596. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You applied, I believe, to be registered before Mr. Guthrie, did you not?—I did.
 10597. Well, and he refused?—He did.
 10598. On what ground?—I applied to register, as holding the keys of the commissioners' offices.
 10599. Did you reside there?—No.
 10600. Then you considered you had a claim to register as holding the keys, you call it; that is to say, having the care?—Having an interest, I conceived, of 20*l.* a year. I was mistaken, and rejected by the barrister.
 10601. *Chairman.*] What had that to do with your right of freedom?—I ascertained that I was mistaken.
 10602. Now, have you made out these two accounts?—Yes; this list contains the number of houses, &c. [*handing the list to his Lordship.*]
 10603. You state that Patrick Skally of Dublin-street was valued, in 1828, at 10*l.*?—Yes.
 10604. And was reduced, in 1831, to 7*l.*?—Yes.
 10605. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you know the ground of that reduction?—Excessive value.
 10606. Do you mean there was an excessive value put on in 1828?—That was the ground of appeal.
 10607. Are you aware whether that was the ground of the reduction?—I believe it was.
 10608. Do you recollect the circumstances?—I recollect the appeal coming before the commissioners.
 10609. But do you recollect whether the premises were proved to have been deteriorated in value subsequent to 1828?—I think so; the appellant stated something to that effect that induced the commissioners to reduce it.
 10610. Then, for anything you can now recollect, that reduction took place in consequence of a reduction in the value after 1828?—I believe so.
 10611. Then, if that were so, it was not because the value was excessive in 1828,

Mr. P. J. Keily.

8 May 1837.

1828, but because the value being fair in 1828, it afterwards became too high by reason of the premises being reduced in value; is that it?—Precisely.

10612. Mr. Hogg.] Did, or did not, the petitioner state in his appeal that the valuation in 1828 was excessive?—That was the ground of his appeal.

10613. And being the ground of appeal, I presume it was the ground on which the decision rested, was it?—I presume it was.

10614. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did you not tell me you recollected, or believed, that the appellant stated, or showed to the commissioners, that the premises had been reduced in value since 1828?—He stated so.

10615. If he stated so, can you undertake to say whether that may not have been the ground on which the commissioners reduced the value?—It was named as a store in 1828, and it became deteriorated in value, I conceive, as he converted it into a stable.

10616. That under those circumstances the valuation ought to be reduced?—Yes; and consequently was.

10617. Why then, in point of fact, the reduction took place because the premises had been deteriorated in value after 1828; is it not so?—I think so.

10618. Mr. Hogg.] The ground of appeal here is, that in 1828, the valuation was excessive?—That was the ground of appeal.

10619. And I presume was the ground of decision?—Yes.

10620. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But did you presume it was the ground of decision; you told me just now the allegation was, that this, which had been a store in 1828, had been converted into a stable since?—So he stated.

10621. That the value of it had been reduced thereby, and that on that ground alone the valuation made in 1828 ought to be reduced?—Yes.

10622. Then, if that is your recollection of it, did not that reduction take place in consequence of the premises being reduced in value subsequent to 1828?—I think so; and so I stated before.

10623. Mr. Hogg.] Is this your book, kept by you?—Yes.

10624. You state truly here the ground on which the person claims a reduction?—Yes, the substance.

10625. You state that truly?—Truly.

10626. Then you have stated here, that the ground on which he claims the reduction is, that the valuation formerly made was excessive?—Yes.

10627. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But does he state that; look at your memorandum.

10628. Mr. Hogg.] If there had been anything like the house having been consumed by fire, or any great alteration or change being made, I presume you would have noted it; he would have stated something of that kind, and you would have made a note of it?—It is to be observed, the ground of appeal may be for excessive value; still the appellant had an opportunity of coming before the board of commissioners, and thereby stating the grounds of objection generally.

10629. But you note the prominent reason he assigns?—I do.

10630. And do not exclude him from entering into minute details; but if there was anything very striking in the reduction of the value, if that were the prominent reason, you would note it as such, provided you note truly, would you not?—I would.

10631. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do you observe there it is stated as an alleged store?—I do observe that.

10632. Do not you understand by that, that the appellant meant to insist that that building, which was alleged to be a store in 1828, was no longer a store, had ceased to be a store?—Yes.

10633. Is not that what was meant by the alleged store?—It is.

10634. In the other column, do you see "excessive valuation"?—I do.

10635. Do you mean to say that that implies the valuation was excessive in 1828; is it not consistent with this, namely, that the valuation is excessive at the time of the appeal; is not this what he means?—Yes, that is my impression.

10636. Accordingly, the result of the items of the two columns taken together is this, that the appeal in that instance was by reason of the valuation being too great at the time when the appeal was made, in consequence of that which had been a store in 1828 being converted into a stable; was not that the substance of the objection?—It was.

10637. And accordingly, that appeal was allowed upon that ground?—I think so, as far as my recollection serves me.

10638. Chairmen.] Bridget Slattery; is that another instance?—Bridget Slattery

Slattery was the landlady; she appealed against the valuation of that house, upon the ground of excessive value; I presume it is in the appeal-book; and the commissioners cancelled that.

10639. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Do you mean to state, her ground of appeal was excessive value?—I believe it was.

10640. Is that from recollection?—That is from my recollection.

10641. Do you always enter in this book the grounds of appeal?—I do.

10642. Accurately?—Accurately from the appeal; the substance of the appeal.

10643. Then what does this entry, under the column "ground of appeal," mean in the case of Bridget Slattery, "Lane not lighted, house consists of two rooms, 1 s. 8 d. per week"?—That was the substance of the appeal.

10644. What was the meaning of "lane not lighted"?—Not having a lamp in the lane.

10645. Is that a ground of excess?—That was contained in the appeal.

10646. But in your judgment was that considered an excess?—No, by no means, because the commissioners could not place lamps in all the lanes in the town, increasing the tax on the public.

10647. Was there any instance of a ground of appeal on account of houses not being proportionately valued with the houses in question?—I believe there was one instance, that I have discovered since I referred to the books, namely, the house of Mr. Howes, in Warren-street; he stated as his objection, that his house was not proportionately rated with houses in the same street; that is the only case I can find.

10648. What was done in that case?—I believe in that case a reduction took place. It was valued in the book of 1828 at 38 l., and it was reduced in 1831, on the appeal, to 30 l., and that was proportionately rated with the houses in the same street, one which, I believe, Miss Grubb lives in.

10649. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] So that the appeal there was not by reason of the absolute value having been too high an absolute value, but too high a relative value?—Precisely so.

10650. *Chairman*.] Then you mean to state, that although that ground of appeal was admitted in this case in 1831, no ground of appeal of a similar nature was brought forward in 1834?—I do not know of any other case at present.

10651. Although it was notorious in Clonmel that a very great number of houses were valued very much under their real rate?—I do not know whether it was or not.

10652. It was not notorious in Clonmel?—I do not know.

10653. Then the belief was, that the rate and the value were about the same?—The real value as a rent, and the value placed on the book, I do not consider were taken as synonymous.

10654. But do you mean to say, that supposing it to be proved, in a great variety of cases, that houses rated at 5 l., 6 l. and 7 l. are of the value of 10 l., 12 l. and 15 l., that that was not known in Clonmel in the year 1834?—I have heard there are many instances of those cases.

10655. Was that notorious in Clonmel in 1834?—I think it was generally known.

10656. But still no parties thought it worth their while to appeal in 1834?—There were appeals in 1834.

10657. Were there any appeals on that ground?—No.

10658. Then they, none of them, thought it worth their while to appeal on that ground?—I suppose not.

10659. In short, there was no appeal in 1834 on that ground?—Not on that ground, as far as my recollection bears me out.

10660. Although there was this precedent of Mr. Howes'?—Yes.

10661. That is the only one within your knowledge, of parties applying on the ground that other parties were underrated?—The only one within my knowledge.

10662. Mr. *Serjeant Ball*.] Was that an appeal on the ground that other parties were underrated, or was it on the ground that his premises were over-rated with reference to others; is not that so?—Yes, it is.

10663. He did not seek to raise the rate on others, but to lower the rate on his own?—Yes.

10664. *Chairman*.] The expression is, that the said house was not proportionately rated with houses in the same street; is not that it?—It is.

039. 3 M 2 10665. Mr.

Mr. P. J. Kebley.

8 May 1857.

10665. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] He must mean by that, it was valued too high; he did not mean to complain it was valued too low, I suppose?—No.

10666. *Chairman.*] Was it the intention of the commissioners to rate all houses at their real value?—I do not know what the intention of the commissioners was in 1828, not being connected with them then.

10667. What was the feeling of the commissioners in 1831?—With regard to what?

10668. Why, that the houses ought to be at their full value?—The feeling of the commissioners in 1831 was, that the valuation of 1828 should stand, as they found that there was an ample income to meet the expenditures, and not to raise the tax on the public, particularly the humbler class.

10669. Is it the same thing to parties paying the rate above 10*l.* and paying the rate above 20*l.*; are no other parties rated too high or too low?—The classes of rating were these: the houses rated at 5*l.* and not 10*l.*, are rated at present 3*d.* in the pound; the houses rated at 10*l.* and not 20*l.*, 5*d.*; the houses rated at 20*l.* and upwards, at 7*d.* per *£.*

10670. Then is it the same thing for the parties above 10*l.* and above 20*l.*, whether or no their valuation is put up at the extreme or not?—I believe it is considered to be a fair value as regards the rates levied.

10671. Is it not an object to the party rated at 20*l.* to be rather rated at 19*l.*?—I do not know that, of my own knowledge.

10672. Is it an object to a party to be under the 10*l.* in the rate, rather than above the 10*l.* in the rate, independent of the 1*l.* difference?—It would, in point of the rates.

10673. Is it not an object for parties rated themselves at 20*l.*, that the real value should be placed on those houses that are near 10*l.*?—I do not know of any complaints of that nature.

10674. Is it no advantage?—I do not know whether it is any advantage to those who are occupying houses of 20*l.* a-year and upwards.

10675. It is a matter of indifference to them whether or no there are a number of houses rated between 5*l.* and 10*l.*, and between 10*l.* and 20*l.*?—I think so, as regards the rates, unless the premises were their own.

10676. Am I to understand that, generally speaking, the feeling in Clonmel is, that the houses are rated at their full value?—Indeed I cannot speak to the general opinion.

10677. What is your opinion?—My opinion is, that if a valuation were to take place next year, which the commissioners are empowered to do, if they choose, that the premises in general would be rated higher than they are at present.

10678. All the premises would, every class?—I think so.

10679. Many more persons would be brought into the 5*l.* class than now?—Yes, that are out of it at present.

10680. When did the commissioners last make a registry of the persons holding tenements of the value of 5*l.*?—The last valuation that took place?

10681. No, I am not talking of the last valuation; the last registry?—

10682. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did you ever make a registry?—No, except a registry of this kind.

10683. How often do they make that?—Annually; the rate-books are made out for the purpose of collecting the watch and lamp taxes.

10684. And is that taken from the old valuation?—Yes, and from the subsequent valuations as amended.

10685. And does not include any one who was not in the old valuation?—Yes; all to the present time inclusive.

10686. *Chairman.*] Refer to the 21st section of your Act; now do you not see it is there laid down, "that it shall be lawful for the commissioners for the time being for the execution of this Act, in any city, town corporate, borough, market town or other town under this Act, and they are hereby authorised, empowered and required, to determine the limits of such city, town corporate, borough, market town or other town respectively, and of the suburbs and liberties thereof respectively to which the purposes of this Act shall extend, and to cause to be kept, and from time to time with all diligence and care, and upon reasonable requests at all times to revise and amend a registry of all the householders resident within such city, town corporate, borough, market town or other town, or the limits of the suburbs and liberties thereof respectively determined by such commissioners as aforesaid, and occupying houses of the annual value of

of 5*l.* or upwards, and such registry shall distinguish such of the said householders as shall occupy houses of the annual value of 20 *l.* or upwards," &c. &c.; now, I want to know when the registry in conformity with that clause in the Act of Parliament was last made?—There are rate-books made out annually, and these books are a registry of the names and descriptions, the value and the rates.

10687. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] They are taken from the former books?—Yes.

10688. Chairman.] When was that registry last made?—In 1834, when the election of the new commissioners was made.

10689. There has been no registry made since then?—Not since 1834.

10690. Not under that clause; you are quite clear of that?—Not since 1834; that is the construction I give the section of the Act of Parliament.

10691. Then when is the next election to be?—On the first Monday in next July.

10692. Then am I to understand that no parties but those that were on the registry in the town of Clonmel for this object in the year 1834 will be permitted to vote for the commissioners in July next?—No; all persons that occupy premises that are valued by the valutors, and rated by the commissioners at 5*l.* and upwards, although their names may not appear upon the registry, will be permitted to vote, provided they have been 12 months previous in possession.

10693. Must not tickets be given by the commissioners?—Yes.

10694. When was the last delivery of tickets made to any individual?—In 1834.

10695. Then how will any parties residing in Clonmel, and occupying houses of 5*l.*, be enabled to vote at the next election, coming to inhabit subsequent to the year 1834, if no tickets have been given since the year 1834?—I will take the liberty of reading this section of the Act: "The clerk of the commissioners is to be prepared to deliver a ticket to every person so registered, who shall demand the same, and such ticket shall be subscribed by the chairman of the commissioners and by the clerk of the commissioners for the time being; and no person shall be admitted to vote at any election except the first election, held pursuant to this Act, unless such persons shall exhibit such tickets at the time of voting, if required so to do; and it shall be lawful for such commissioners, at their discretion, to take measures to preclude the intrusion of any persons not provided with tickets into the place of meeting."

10696. Is there any clause in the Act of Parliament which alters that particular clause?—This clause, I conceive, bears upon it; the 16th section: "And be it further enacted, that at all meetings for the election of commissioners for the execution of this Act which shall be held subsequent to the first election of commissioners, saving and excepting the elections hereinafter appointed to be made by the surviving or remaining commissioners, in any city, borough or town, every person shall be admitted and entitled to vote who shall occupy, and who for twelve months then next previous shall have occupied, within such city, borough or town, or the liberties or suburbs thereof, to which, as determined by the commissioners for such city, borough or town, in virtue of the discretion hereinafter vested in them, the purposes of this Act shall extend or be extended, a dwelling-house of the annual value of 5*l.* at the least, and none other person whatsoever, and the registry hereinafter directed to be made shall be conclusive evidence of the aforementioned qualifications; and the chairman of the commissioners for the time being for the execution of this Act shall, previously to the first Monday in July in the year in which such election shall take place, give due notice in manner by this Act required with respect to the first meeting to be held under this Act, that a meeting will be holden on such first Monday in July for the election of commissioners for the execution of this Act for the three years next succeeding, and such chairman shall, at and in such election, proceed in such manner as the mayor or other chief magistrate or justices presiding at the first meeting to be held under this Act are hereinbefore directed to proceed in the election of the commissioners to be first appointed for the execution of this Act, and shall decide all questions which may arise as to the eligibility or qualification of any persons whatsoever, and as to all other matters whatsoever connected with the said election, and shall certify the result of the same to the commissioners for the time for the execution of this Act in such city, borough or town as aforesaid where such election shall be made." That section of the Act has been complied with since I came into office.

10697. Now, does that relieve the commissioners from the necessity of issuing tickets to parties who are to vote?—A subsequent clause gives them liberty to issue those tickets, and those tickets have been issued by the commissioners.

Mr. P. J. Kelly.

8 May 1837.

10698. Does it not say, "Such commissioners shall cause a ticket containing an extract from such registry to be prepared and delivered to every person so registered who shall demand the same;" and does it not further say, "that no person shall be admitted to vote at any election except the first election held pursuant to this Act, unless such persons shall exhibit such tickets at the time of voting, if required so to do"?—Yes.

10699. Then I want to know, how does the clause you just read rebuke the commissioners from the liability of issuing those tickets, and the necessity of the parties tendering to vote producing them?—With regard to that question I can only say, that those tickets have to my knowledge been made out in 1831 and in 1834.

10700. Have any tickets of that character been issued since 1834?—I should correct myself; in 1831 I was not clerk; that is when the tickets issued.

10701. Have any tickets been issued since 1834?—No, no election of new commissioners having taken place.

10702. And no new registry of the parties residing in Clonmel since 1834 has taken place either, has it?—Yes, annually, there are rate-books made out, which contain that registry that your Lordship alludes to, and for the purpose of collecting the lamp and watch taxes.

10703. What was the date of that last registry?—The last registry was made commencing the 1st of August 1836, and ending the 31st of July 1837.

10704. Now, can you produce to the Committee a copy of the registry made commencing the 1st of August 1836?—This is it.

10705. Then this was made in 1836?—Yes, it was.

10706. Then I am to understand, that wherever I see a party's house put down at 5 *l.*, it is the value of 5 *l.*, is it, and no more?—In the column of valuation, it is 5 *l.*, and not 10 *l.*; a house rated at 5 *l.*, and not 10 *l.*; 10 *l.* and not 20 *l.*; 20 *l.* and upwards.

10707. Then I am to understand that the commissioners gave their sanction to this valuation of all the rate-payers in the town of Clonmel in August last?—Yes.

10708. And that therefore, if they have admitted parties wrongly on the registry in August last, they have not performed their duty according to the Act of Parliament, have they?—I conceive that they have not violated the Act of Parliament.

10709. Are they not prescribed by the 21st section of the Act to distinguish such of the persons as shall occupy houses of the value of 5 *l.*?—They are.

10710. And of the value of 20 *l.*?—Yes.

10711. And how have they ascertained that?—From the collector's book; it frequently occurs that there are deaths and changes of residence, and the collector takes down the name of the person occupying the premises at the time the rates are paid.

10712. Now, in making out this book on which parties are to vote at the ensuing election for commissioners, they have adopted the valuation in this book, have they not?—The valuation in the former books; yes.

10713. Except in the case where you have specified the alteration?—That is an amended valuation of the whole, from 1828 to the present time inclusive.

10714. And therefore they have sanctioned that valuation, as far as their authority is a sanction of it?—Yes, so I conceive.

10715. And therefore, if it be true, as has been stated by the former witness in this room, that that valuation is incorrect, they have sanctioned that incorrectness?—I conceive that the reason the valuation was sanctioned, was, because the commissioners being found there was an ample income, they adopted the valuation; and having a balance on hands, and not wishing to raise the rates on the tax-payers, particularly on the lower classes, was the reason, I think, there was not a re-valuation made; likewise, I should observe, that the valuation in 1828 cost 30 *l.*, and I should imagine it would cost near or about the same sum now. I wish to state that a copy of the valuation, being for the year commencing the 1st August 1836 to the 31st July 1837, is handed to the collector for the purpose of collecting the watch and lamp tax, and that that book will be the criterion to issue tickets from for the election of new commissioners the next opportunity, because he returns the names accurately of those persons occupying premises for 12 months previous to the issuing of those tickets for the election of new commissioners.

Mercurii, 16^a die Maii, 1837.

MEMBERS PRESENT.

Mr. Serjeant Ball.
 Sir Robert Ferguson.
 Mr. French.
 Mr. Hamilton.

Mr. Serjeant Jackson.
 Mr. Lecky.
 Lord Granville Somerset.

LORD GRANVILLE SOMERSET, IN THE CHAIR.

Mr. Dennis Walsh, called in; and further Examined.

10716. Mr. *Hamilton*.] IN answer to Question 8560, you have stated, "I think either eight or nine Protestants were proposed," at the second election of commissioners, "and they would not act, with the exception of two or three;" do you adhere to that statement?—Yes; there is no doubt of it.

10717. Will you state who are the two or three who acted?—Mr. George Glascoot acted for a few days; Mr. Fell acted.

10718. Will you state the names of those who refused to act?—Mr. David Malcomson, Thomas Murphy, Thomas Greer and James Burke; Charles Adison acted; William White acted for part of the time, for about two years.

10719. *Chairman*.] Have you never stated that he did not act?—No, I never stated that he did not act; I knew that he acted.

10720. Was this question ever put to you, "Who was the Quaker that refused to act"?—I think it was.

10721. What was your answer to that?—That Mr. Malcomson refused to act. Mr. Glascoot went to the meeting twice, and he refused acting afterwards.

10722. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Then, in point of fact, it is true that Mr. William White declined to act, after having acted in the first instance?—Yes, after having acted about two years.

10723. Mr. White and Mr. Malcomson are both Quakers?—They are; and Mr. Murphy and Mr. Greer are Quakers also. Mr. Greer is since dead.

10724. And they both declined acting?—They all refused acting.

10725. You have no doubt that the Quakers at Clonmel are all in the conservative interest?—They are all considered in the conservative interest.

10726. In the evidence of Mr. Joseph Higgins, 3065, he is asked whether they are in the conservative interest; and he says, not in the conservative interest; do you concur in that statement?—I know of one man, named John Luby, who could not get employment from any of the Quakers in Clonmel, although he had a discharge from Mr. Malcomson, in consequence of his voting at the last election for Mr. Romayne.

10727. Mr. *Hamilton*.] Can you state whether Mr. Moore Labarte was elected a commissioner in 1831?—He was.

10728. Did he act or not?—I stated on the last day that he was chairman, and he acted for three years.

10729. So that you would add his name to the four you have mentioned as having also acted?—Yes.

10730. He is a Protestant?—He is.

10731. Was Richard Vowell elected a commissioner under the 9 Geo. 4, in 1831?—He was.

10732. Did he act?—He acted for part of the time.

10733. He is a Protestant also?—He is.

10734. Mr. *Lecky*.] Why did the gentlemen who acted for a time cease to act?—I believe it was in consequence of the election in 1832. The town became divided between the two parties of reformers and conservatives; it was completely divided.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.
 10 May 1837.

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

10 May 1837.

10735. There was such an inundation of the other party?—Politics ran very high between them, and the conservatives did not wish to act with the others.
10736. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You stated that the Quakers were in the conservative interest; do you recollect an action or actions being brought against the proprietor of the Free Press?—Yes, two actions.
10737. At what time was that?—It was after the election of 1835.
10738. What were those actions brought for?—For a libel in the Free Press.
10739. Who were the plaintiffs in the actions?—A person who was a clerk to Mr. Malcomson, Mr. William Strangman, and Mr. Labarte was the plaintiff in another.
10740. Was that also for a libel?—Yes.
10741. Who was understood to have got up those actions?—The Quakers and the conservatives. The venue was laid for Kilkenny. I was by at the trial, and Mr. William Smith, who was examined here; I heard him swear that there was a subscription got up for the purpose of putting down the Free Press.
10742. Got up where, and by whom?—By the Quakers and conservatives at Clonmel.
10743. He stated that on oath?—He did; he stated that he subscribed *et* himself.
10744. Is he considered a strong politician?—He is.
10745. You say he subscribed *et*; is he in very flourishing circumstances himself?—He is now, I believe, pretty fair; he was at one time in difficulties.
10746. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Is this Free Press a violent party paper?—I do not say that it is violent; it always takes part with the reformers.
10747. And what you call radicals?—Yes.
10748. Being pretty strong in that way yourself, you do not consider the paper violent; you consider it moderate?—It always supports its own party.
10749. Strongly?—Indeed it does.
10750. Do you know any stronger provincial paper?—I do. I think the Limerick Star is as strong; I do not say stronger. I think the Free Press supports its own party as strenuously as any other.
10751. Had it been indulging in the publication of libellous articles upon the conservatives?—There were two actions brought, and damages given.
10752. Were there other articles in the same strain reflecting upon other people?—There was one article that exposed the way in which Mr. Bagwell's committee conducted the election.
10753. Did it attack the individuals of the committee?—They gave an account of the way in which Mr. Bagwell's committee kept some of the voters locked up.
10754. In doing that, did they not individually attack him?—They named Mr. Bagwell. They stated that Mr. Bagwell had a parcel of voters locked up, and that some unfortunate females got in for the purpose of dancing with those voters; and they stated that Mr. Bagwell danced with one of those.
10755. Did they charge other gentlemen by name?—I do not know that they did.
10756. Were there other articles of the same description from time to time in that paper?—There were several articles with regard to the election, as is usual in such cases.
10757. And attacking individuals?—Not in their private character, but in their public character.
10758. Attacking them in the same way that they attacked Mr. Bagwell, and accusing them of having prostitutes; that was the meaning of it, was it not?—Yes.
10759. Were there other imputations cast?—Anything with regard to the election I believe they gave.
10760. Are you surprised that people should bring actions against the paper when they went on in that way?—Indeed I am not.
10761. Do not you think it was perfectly reasonable and proper that gentlemen who had been held up in that way to public contempt and scorn should bring actions against that paper?—I do not blame them. And the late Mr. Rowayne brought an action against the conservative paper, which was supported by Mr. Bagwell and his party, and he got damages to a large amount.
10762. To what amount?—£. 1,200.

10763. Were

10763. Were those damages ever paid?—No; they were due at the death of Mrs. Carson, the lady that owned the paper.
10764. What was the name of the paper?—The Clonmel Advertiser. Mrs. Carson took the benefit of the Insolvent Act; and on her cross-examination, it came out that the rector, the Rev. Dr. Bell, the Protestant clergyman, was the writer of the libel; and Mr. Ronayne commenced an action against him, and he got damages in Kilkenny against the Rev. Dr. Bell for writing the libel.
10765. To what amount?—£. 100., and would have got more but for the former verdict given against Mrs. Carson for the same libel.
10766. Were you on the jury?—No, I was there as a witness.
10767. How do you know he would have got more?—I heard so; I was at the hotel when some of the jurors came out, and I heard one of the jurors say, "Ronayne would have got more, but he got very large damages before, and 100 l. is quite enough."
10768. Was he paid the 100 l.?—He was.
10769. Was the verdict against Mrs. Carson suffered to stand, and never set aside?—Never set aside; Mr. Ronayne, after getting the verdict in Waterford, told Mrs. Carson that he would relinquish the damages and pay her costs if she gave up the author of the libel, and she refused it; I myself went to Mrs. Carson, even when she was arrested, and told her, that if she then gave up the author of the libel, Mr. Ronayne would not go further, but give her a clear receipt for the damages, and she refused.
10770. How came you to go?—As a friend of Mr. Ronayne.
10771. Were you employed by Mr. Ronayne?—I was directed by him to go.
10772. You were a very sanguine friend of Mr. Ronayne's?—I was.
10773. At the election?—Yes.
10774. And at the registries?—I should not think there was a man in Clonmel more attentive to the registries than I was.
10775. Did you bring up witnesses to the registries?—I did not.
10776. Can you say that you did not bring up witnesses to support votes?—I did not.
10777. Did you ever ask a person to come forward and be a witness?—I did.
10778. Have you in more instances than one applied to people to come up and give evidence as to value at the registry?—At the last registry but one Mr. Howley wanted to have witnesses produced to prove the value, and I chanced to mention the names of a few persons.
10779. Did not Mr. Howley, in certain cases, object to register the parties that tendered themselves, after examining them as to the value?—He did, unless they brought forward witnesses.
10780. Were not you the person to get witnesses in those cases?—No; I chanced to mention names.
10781. To whom did you mention them?—In court; I cannot exactly say to whom; I mentioned it to persons about me.
10782. Who were the persons?—Several electors in Clonmel; Mr. Keily, Mr. Lacey and Mr. O'Brien.
10783. Were they persons that were active in the liberal party?—They were.
10784. Did you mention those names with a view to get the witnesses up?—No, I mentioned that such and such people could go and value; it was a case in which there was very great dispute.
10785. Why did you mention those persons to go and value?—There was a man mentioned, named Gleeson, and I mentioned Mr. Thornton, and different persons; there were great disputes between the conservative counsel and the attorney conducting the case, but the barrister said that he would not register unless they got witnesses, and so they both agreed to send two persons out of court to value, and one of the persons I suggested was appointed.
10786. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Who was that?—A man named Gleeson, a mason.
10787. Mr. Serjeant Jackson.] Was he a man in the same interest with yourself?—He was.
10788. Did he go and inspect houses?—He did.
10789. Was he a witness that was subsequently examined?—He was, and there was another.
10790. Who was the other?—I do not recollect his name.
10791. Was

Mr. Dennis Walsh,
to May 1837.

10791. Was he upon the liberal side?—The voter whose cause we took up was a Protestant, and I do not think he would vote for the liberal side.
10792. Were there other witnesses examined in support of the vote besides your nominee Gleeson?—He was not my nominee, but I suggested him.
10793. Was there any other person examined?—I think there was a second person, but I do not know his name.
10794. Where does that Gleeson live?—In Clonmel.
10795. Is he himself a voter?—He is.
10796. Had he been examined as a witness before?—I do not know whether he had.
10797. Has he been examined as a witness since?—I do not recollect that he has.
10798. To sustain whose vote was it that he was examined?—A man named Smith.
10799. Where does he live?—Near the court-house.
10800. Was he registered?—He was.
10801. Did the barrister, after having refused to register him, let it stand over for another day?—No; he let it stand over for an hour; upon the cross-examination the barrister had some doubt, and Mr. Cahill, who was conducting the registry for the liberal side, told Mr. Mulcahy to produce a witness, and he would not, and then the barrister said, "Let there be two persons chosen in court, and go and value the house; I will let the matter stand over for an hour;" he did so, and the two persons came back and swore that the house was worth 10*l*.
10802. The one appointed upon the conservative side, and the other appointed upon the liberal side?—No; Mr. Mulcahy was called upon, both himself and Mr. Kellest, to appoint persons, and I believe they refused, and then the barrister told them to get any two persons in court that would go out and value it.
10803. And you are sure there were two persons?—I believe there were two, and I believe the second man was sworn, but I am not sure.
10804. By whom was the second person named?—I do not know.
10805. Did you ever in any other instance name a witness, or procure a witness to sustain a vote?—I might, but I do not recollect.
10806. Then it could not have happened often?—No, it could not; if it happened twice or three times, that is the most.
10807. Do you attend upon the whole of the registry?—I do.
10808. Are you one of a committee for the purpose?—I am.
10809. Of how many does the committee consist?—Sometimes five, sometimes seven.
10810. Is it a permanent committee?—No, I do not think it is; in fact, any three or four of them may go and bring up persons to register them, and they serve the notices for them.
10811. Are the pacificators, who have been recently appointed under the recommendation of the Roman-catholic Association, members of that committee?—I believe Mr. Butler is; it is just a committee for a few days, while they are getting notices served for the persons.
10812. Do they communicate with the General Association?—I do not think they do.
10813. Do they state the results of the registries?—Not to my knowledge; they may have done so.
10814. Is not that part of the duty of the pacificators?—It is part of their duty to attend to the registry, but the pacificator, Mr. Butler, is the most inactive man of the registering committee at Clonmel.
10815. Is it part of the duty of the pacificator to communicate to the General Association in Dublin the result of the registration?—I do not know that it is; I heard that one of their duties was to attend to the registry, and another is to report if there are any illegal societies in the parish.
10816. What Dublin newspaper do you commonly read?—I read mostly, when I am at home, the Evening Mail and the Evening Freeman, and the Pilot.
10817. The Pilot reports pretty accurately the Association proceedings?—It does.
10818. Did not you read the proceedings upon the appointment of pacificators?—I never felt much interest in it.
10819. Did not you read that?—No, I do not recollect that I did.

10820. You

10820. You had no curiosity about it?—No, I had not the least.
10821. You are very anxious about the registries, are not you?—I am.
10822. You have stated that there is no man in Clonmel more active than yourself about the registries?—No.
10823. And you know it was part of the functions of the pacificators to be very active about the registries?—I think it was one of the duties, but I have not read the proceedings through.
10824. You being so very anxious about the registries, and knowing that it was part of the functions of those pacificators to be active about the registries, did not you attend to the proceedings of the Association upon that subject?—I attended to the registries when the Association was not in existence at all.
10825. But you did not feel less interest after the Association was formed?—It did not make the least impression upon my mind.
10826. You were so zealous in the cause before that your zeal could not be well increased?—I could not be more attentive to the registry than I was.
10827. Therefore, having that great zeal in the cause, and finding that, in aid of that cause, those pacificators were appointed to that branch of duty, did not you examine what their functions were?—Indeed I did not; in fact, I think both parties in Clonmel are equally anxious about the registry.
10828. Do you know Mr. Butler?—I do.
10829. You know he was a pacificator, appointed under the Association?—I think I heard that he was.
10830. Had you ever the curiosity to ask him about it?—No.
10831. Nor to congratulate him upon his high appointment?—No.
10832. Mr. *Hamilton*.] On whose evidence was Dr. Bell convicted of writing the libel against Mr. Romayne?—On the evidence of his own friend.
10833. Who was that?—Mr. Edward O'Neill.
10834. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] What is Mr. Edward O'Neill?—A bookseller and stationer.
10835. Mr. *Hamilton*.] You stated that it came out, on the cross-examination of Mrs. Carson, that Dr. Bell was the author of the libel?—I was by when Mrs. Carson was under examination; something slipped from her from which Mr. Romayne thought he had good grounds to suppose that Dr. Bell was the person who wrote the libel, and Dr. Bell was served with a latitat, and Mr. O'Neill was served with a subpoena, and I suppose he was two hours under examination before he admitted that Dr. Bell was the writer of the libel.
10836. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] But he did ultimately admit it?—He did.
10837. This libel obtained damages to the amount of 1,300*l.*; it may be presumed, therefore, that it was a strong libel?—I heard Chief Baron *Joy* say that he never read so foul a libel.
10838. Who is Dr. Bell?—He keeps the Endowed School of Clonmel.
10839. He is the person to whom the education of the youth at the Endowed School is committed?—Yes.
10840. And he still holds that situation?—He does.
10841. Does he hold any other situation?—Not that I know of; his son is curate to the Rev. Mr. Rhodes, the rector of the parish.
10842. How long has Dr. Bell been master of the Endowed School?—A great many years; I think near 20 years.
10843. What is the situation worth to him?—It is worth a good deal; I think I heard from 800*l.* to 1,000 *l.* a-year.
10844. Does he officiate as a clergyman also?—He does, in Clonmel.
10845. But he does not hold any church preferment?—He has some sinecure he has some parishes that he gets tithes out of.
10846. Are they in Clonmel, or in the neighbourhood?—No, they are eight or ten miles from it, or a dozen.
10847. *Chairman*.] Do you call a parochial minister a sinecurist; do you say that a parish minister who has a parish has a sinecure?—There are some parish ministers who have sinecures.
10848. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Those that do no duty there?—Yes.
10849. Does Dr. Bell do any duty in this parish where he gets the tithes?—No.
10850. Mr. *French*.] Does he keep a curate?—No; there is no duty. There are what are called dumb parishes.

Mr. Denis Walsh.

20 May 1837.

10851. Are there any Protestant parishioners in it?—I suppose not; there are very few, if there are any.

10852. Is there a church?—I believe not.

10853. *Mr. Serjeant Jackson.*] What is the name of the parish?—I do not know the name; it is near New Inn. There are several parishes about Clonmel in which there are no churches.

10854. And in which, of course, the clergyman is a sinecurist?—Yes.

10855. *Mr. Hamilton.*] You stated that Mrs. Carson had taken the benefit of the Act before the second action?—Yes.

10856. You stated that you went to see her when she was in confinement?—Yes; she had not taken the benefit of the Act then.

10857. Had she been discharged before the second action?—She was.

10858. Then it was known that she was an insolvent?—When examined before the commissioner, he remanded her for seven months.

10859. Had the seven months expired previous to the second action?—Yes, they had.

10860. So that she was a discharged insolvent at that period?—She was.

10861. It was known then that the first fine of 1,200*l.* could not be paid?—She had some property, and Mr. Ronayne's solicitor was taking proceedings to recover it.

10862. *Mr. Serjeant Bell.*] Was it thought that they might recover it?—I heard Mr. Bagg, at Dungarvan, say that they would recover great part of it; he was Mr. Ronayne's attorney.

10863. Then the first jury having given a verdict against the publisher of 1,200*l.*, the second jury, having discovered the real author, gave a verdict of only 100*l.*?—Yes.

10864. *Mr. Serjeant Bell.*] That was because the jury considered that the 1,200*l.* that had been given before ought to be taken into account in the estimate of damages?—Yes.

10865. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Being aware at the time that she was an insolvent?—There was some property disposed of while she was in goal, and which Mr. Ronayne might get, and which I believe his friends are looking after.

10866. *Mr. Serjeant Bell.*] You say that she was remanded for seven months; that is a long period to remain an insolvent; what was that for?—Of course I cannot state that; but I heard the commissioner say that it was in consequence of her refusing to give up the author, after the fair, honourable offer that Mr. Ronayne made her, that he would forgive her the damages and pay her costs if she would give up the author of the libel. Mr. Pether, who was conducting the case for Mrs. Carson, had Dr. Bell as security for all his costs, and Dr. Bell refused to pay them; and there was a record about being tried at the last assizes, and Dr. Bell had to pay all the costs.

10867. So that it appeared that Mrs. Carson's attorney in that action was guaranteed his costs by Dr. Bell?—He was.

10867*. And then Dr. Bell having refused to pay the costs, he brought an action against Dr. Bell?—Yes, and the jury were about being sworn at the last assizes, when Dr. Bell gave up, and settled the costs.

10868. And he had the costs of the action against himself also?—Yes, five hundred and odd pounds.

10869. With respect to the Free Press, you have stated that an action has been brought for a libel published in the Free Press; has that been the case more than once?—Twice, by Mr. William Strangman and Mr. Edward Labarte.

10870. Can you state the amount of damages in each of those cases?—I can; there were 750*l.* Mr. Strangman got in Kilkenny against Mr. Hackett, and Mr. Labarte got 200*l.* in Clonmel.

10871. What was the nature of the libel in the case of Mr. Strangman?—It was an allusion to Miss Grubb and Lieutenant Close, who were lost in the *Suhr*, and there was some allusion to Mr. Strangman, and he got a verdict on that account.

10872. *Chairman.*] Has Mr. Hackett paid the damages?—Mr. Labarte, who was attorney to Mr. Strangman, thought the damages were so very high, that he induced Mr. Strangman to take 300*l.* off, and he has paid the 450*l.*; and in his own case he thought that he was awarded too much, and he only required his costs.

10873. *Mr. Serjeant Bell.*] So that in the first case in which Mr. Strangman

was the plaintiff, even the plaintiff's attorney considered that the verdict of the jury was exorbitant?—I heard him say so.

10874. And he induced his own client to reduce that verdict by the sum of 300*l.*?—I heard him say that 100*l.* was quite enough for his client.

10875. Was that the general impression with respect to that verdict?—Indeed it was, at Clonmel.

10876. *Chairman.*] Then it appears that Mr. Labarte is not a man of very vindictive feelings?—No, I do not think he is.

10877. Did Mr. Ronayne ever think of giving up any part of the 1,200*l.* damages against this woman?—I cannot say; I heard Mr. Ronayne say, after getting the verdict in Waterford, "I will pay all the costs that are gone to now if Mrs. Carson gives me up the letters that she received."

10878. She refused to give up the author, and then he never thought of diminishing the damages against Mrs. Carson?—I do not know that he did; but I know that I made several offers to forgive the damages if she would give up the name of the writer.

10879. You were not empowered to tell her that the damages would be reduced, unless upon that condition?—No, I was not.

10880. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Since the real author has been discovered and convicted, has Mr. Ronayne, or have his friends, taken any step to reduce the demand against Mrs. Carson?—They are at present taking proceedings against the property that was disposed of whilst she was in confinement.

10881. *Chairman.*] The whole amount of damages?—The property that they could come at would not cover the whole amount, nor half of it.

10882. Do you understand that they have reduced their demand?—I do not.

10883. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] Was the verdict of 1,200*l.* considered exorbitant? Not for that libel, for it charged that Mr. Ronayne, through his stupidity, hanged almost all the clients that he was ever engaged for.

10884. *Chairman.*] Do you think it is a more serious charge to accuse a man of being a bad counsel than to accuse a man of being a participator in the murder of a woman?—I think the charge against Mr. Ronayne was by far more serious than the charge against Mr. Strangman.

10885. You would rather be accused of murder than of being a bad counsel?—Mr. Ronayne was accused of different murders, through his stupidity.

10886. Was he ever accused of murder?—The Rev. Dr. Bell accused him of it.

10887. Do you mean to say that that libel was an accusation of Mr. Ronayne of having participated in murder?—In several murders, through his stupidity.

10888. You think a man would rather be accused of participating in the commission of a murder than of being a stupid counsel, and thereby allowing his clients to be hanged when they ought to get off?—I think the charge against Mr. Ronayne was more serious than the charge against Mr. Strangman; for there were several in Clonmel that did not think, and some had sworn that they did not think, the allusion was to Mr. Strangman; there was a gentleman residing out of Clonmel that read the libel, and he swore that he took it for another person.

10889. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] The import of the libel was obscure?—It was.

10890. It was not a direct charge of participating in murder?—Not at all; it was only an allusion.

10891. Was the libel of Dr. Bell merely a charge of stupidity, or was it a direct charge of having been accessory to the murder of his clients?—As well as I recollect, the writer of the libel said, that through his stupidity and everything else, he hanged many of his clients, which the judges of the going assizes could testify.

10892. *Chairman.*] That you think is much more serious than accusing an individual of aiding and participating in a murder?—I think the charge against Mr. Ronayne is much more serious, because there were several that read the other that did not credit that the allusion was made to Mr. Strangman at all.

10893. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] Was not this libel against Mr. Ronayne calculated to injure him most seriously in his profession?—It was.

10894. To deprive him of all practice in his profession?—It was.

10895. Mr. *Hamilton.*] Do you think it has often happened that men have been hanged through the stupidity of their counsel?—I cannot say; but I do not think that ever a man was hanged through Mr. Ronayne.

Mr. Dennis Wolfe,
10 May 1837.

10896. *Chairman.*] You would not mind being accused of having committed a murder?—I would indeed.

10897. You would rather be accused of having committed murder than be accused of being a stupid advocate?—I do not say that Mr. Strangman was accused of having committed murder.

10898. Was not that the opinion of the jury?—That was the opinion of the jury, though there were two or three persons examined that swore that they took the allusion to be to another person.

10899. But some person or persons were accused of committing murder, or of having been concerned in a murder?—I did read the libel, and I do not think it would have been proceeded against at all, but that there was a subscription set on foot by Mr. Bagwell; and I was by when Mr. Bagwell was under examination by the late Baron Smith's son, and he was asked, "Would you like to see the Free Press suppressed?" he said he would, and Mr. Smith asked him, "Would you like to see that which is giving respectable support to nine children suppressed, and would you like to see Mr. Hackett and his family cast on the world?" and he swore that he would like to see Mr. Hackett thrown on the world, and to see the Free Press suppressed.

10900. *Chairman.*] What Mr. Bagwell was this?—The late candidate; that was in consequence of a letter which appeared holding Mr. Bagwell up as dancing with immoral characters in his committee rooms.

10901. Did he ever bring an action for that?—No.

10902. So that Mr. Bagwell allowed that libel to go unpunished?—He did.

10903. No redress was sought for it?—Never.

10904. Mr. *Freck.*] Would it have been worth Mr. Bagwell's while to have taken notice of a thing of the kind?—I think when he took notice of the other that it would.

10905. Did Mr. Bagwell bring an action for the other?—He subscribed towards it; he subscribed towards Mr. Strangman's action; Mr. Malcolson subscribed 40 *l.*, and so did Mr. Taylor.

10906. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] Is he a Quaker?—He is.

10907. Mr. *Freck.*] You think Mr. Bagwell ought to have proceeded against the editor of the paper for that libel?—I do.

10908. *Chairman.*] Was not Mr. Labarte, at the very moment when Mr. Bagwell was supposed to have given this evidence, Mr. Bagwell's agent?—No.

10909. How long had he ceased to be his agent?—After the election of 1835.

10910. You said that this action was brought immediately after the election of 1835?—It was.

10911. How soon after the election of 1835 did Mr. Labarte cease to be his agent?—I do not know that it was 12 months.

10912. Was this action brought within 12 months of the election?—It was.

10913. And Mr. Labarte, being Mr. Bagwell's agent, although you say Mr. Bagwell had such an anxiety to ruin Mr. Hackett, yet Mr. Labarte urged the taking 300*l.* off the damages against Mr. Hackett?—He did, but he was not at this time Mr. Bagwell's agent; Mr. Gordon, I believe, his cousin, is now his agent.

10914. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] You have stated that Mr. Labarte ceased to be Mr. Bagwell's attorney about 12 months after the election of 1835; do you know when this action was tried?—Immediately after the election of 1835.

10915. Was it in the year 1835?—It was.

10916. Then do you state that Mr. Labarte was not the attorney of Mr. Bagwell when that action was tried?—He was.

10917. But he was not the attorney of Mr. Bagwell at the time he requested his client, Mr. Strangman, to reduce the damages?—I do not think he was; Mr. Labarte had to take proceedings against Mr. Bagwell after the election for his costs at the election.

10918. Mr. *Hamilton.*] At the time of the action Mr. Labarte was the attorney for the conservative party, who subscribed to pay the expenses of the action?—He was.

10919. And he recommended a reduction of the demand?—He did.

10920. *Chairman.*] Was Mr. Bagwell one of the subscribers to the action?—He was.

10921. Mr. *Serjeant Ball.*] Was he asked that question at the trial?—I think he was.

10922. Was

10922. Was not Mr. Labarte, therefore, his attorney upon that occasion?—He was Mr. Stranginan's attorney.

10923. Did not the plaintiffs, upon that occasion, at the instance of Mr. Labarte, consent to receive 300*l.* less than the verdict of the jury?—Some time after the verdict was given, I believe in November following, between the assizes and the November following, they were induced to take 300*l.* less, at the suggestion of Mr. Labarte.

10924. Had Mr. Labarte any power to reduce the damages, except with the consent of the persons that instituted the action?—Certainly not.

10925. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] Are you aware that if Mr. Bagwell had brought an action for that alleged libel upon him, it might have been in the power of Mr. Hackett to have justified, as it is termed, that is to say, to have proved the truth of the alleged libel?—He could.

10926. Mr. *Hamilton*.] You think he could have proved the truth of it?—I am satisfied he could; several persons saw him.

10927. Then there are females of that description in Clonmel?—Of course there are.

10928. *Chairman*.] Where do they live?—I cannot say.

10929. Mr. Serjeant *Ball*.] You stated, upon a former day, that there was no house of ill fame in Clonmel?—I did.

10930. If there are women of bad character, they must live somewhere?—Of course they must live somewhere; but if the clergyman knew there was a house of ill fame in the town, he would get it put down; there is not one at present, but there are always bad characters.

10931. Do they lodge in some obscure places, which are not known to the respectable inhabitants?—Yes.

10932. And there are not what are called houses of ill fame?—No.

10933. You say that you knew the fact that Mr. Hackett could have proved the truth of the allegations in that libel?—He could.

10934. You have said that you are aware it is in the power of a defendant, against whom an action for a libel is brought, to justify, that is to say, to prove the truth of the alleged libel; and if he succeeds in proving the truth of it, must not he get a verdict from the jury?—Yes.

10935. And of course the action would be defeated?—Of course.

10936. And the plaintiff would have to pay the costs of it?—Yes.

10937. If that had occurred in this case, namely, if Mr. Bagwell had brought an action, and Mr. Hackett had justified, and proved the truth of his justification, Mr. Bagwell would have been in a worse situation than before?—He would.

10938. Then the result is, that in your judgment, Mr. Bagwell acted a very discreet part in not bringing the action?—He did; he was very well inclined to bring the action against Mr. Hackett, but he thought it more prudent not to proceed.

10939. You stated that Mr. Bagwell was examined upon the trial at Kilkenny, and that he admitted that he had subscribed to the action; was Mr. William Smith also examined as a witness, and did he admit that he had subscribed to the action?—He did.

10940. Do you recollect whether there was any other witness examined?—There was; Mr. Gordon.

10941. Did he subscribe?—Yes.

10942. Do you recollect any other witness who was examined upon that trial having subscribed to the bringing of the action?—I do not know whether Dr. Burgess did or did not, but he was examined.

10943. But you are quite clear that two of the witnesses examined at the trial of that action subscribed money to the getting up of the action?—They did; Mr. Smith swore that there was a list went about, and that he himself subscribed.

10944. Mr. *Hamilton*.] You have stated that you know that Mr. Hackett could have proved the truth of what was stated in that paper; on what grounds do you make that assertion?—On the statement of one of the persons that was in Mr. Bagwell's room, or more.

10945. Can you mention their names?—I cannot.

10946. Were they friends of Mr. Bagwell?—I do not know. There were several persons after they voted, who admitted that they were kept locked up
0.39. inside,

Mr. Dennis Walsh.

10 May 1837.

inside, and several of them told the people that Mr. Bagwell did dance, and that they were kept locked up themselves by those persons.

10947. Can you repeat the names of any of those persons?—I can name one of them, a man named John Collins, a baker, who told me that he got 10*l.* for voting for Mr. Bagwell.

10948. Where does he live?—In Sherlock's-lane.

10949. So that your assertion, that you know that that could have been proved, is grounded upon hearsay evidence, upon the statement of Collins?—No; I believe you will find persons that will prove it; at least, I am sure that it will be stated to your satisfaction that Mr. Hackett had the best information.

10950. You have said that you knew it could have been proved?—So they told me.

10951. And when you are asked the grounds of that proof, you state that you heard it from a man of the name of Collins?—Yes.

10952. And he admitted he had received 10*l.* as a bribe?—Yes.

10953. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] From whom?—From Mr. Edward Labarte, the agent of Mr. Bagwell, and from Mr. Strangman.

10954. Was he also in Mr. Bagwell's interest?—He was.

10955. Mr. Hamilton.] So that your proof is the assertion of a man that acknowledged that he had been bribed?—It was quite notorious about Clonmel that such a thing did occur.

10956. But you cannot give the names of any other persons?—No, I cannot; but I think some of the gentlemen that are to be examined will be able to prove it.

10957. Do you think the evidence of a man that acknowledged that he had been bribed was sufficient to justify a charge of that kind?—I do not think it is, but there are circumstances connected with this that would go to corroborate it.

10958. Chairman.] Then the party in Clonmel that subscribed to support the action against Mr. Hackett were nevertheless content to take 300*l.* less than they might have exacted from him?—The party were not; but Mr. Edward Labarte, who I believe was a particular friend of Mr. Strangman's, induced Mr. Strangman, I believe, to take the money. Mr. Bagwell swore that he would like to see the Free Press suppressed; and there was his uncle, Mr. Gordon, and the people of Clonmel were more surprised at his going forward than they were at any other person that went, because Mr. Hackett had it in his power to have sent one of his family out of the country but a short time before that if he had chosen.

10959. What do you mean by the expression of sending him out of the country?—He caught Mr. Gordon's son in the act of taking property out of his shop; a part of his property was taken out of his shop, and the mother sent it home when she discovered it.

10960. How old was this son?—As well as I recollect, above 18.

10961. Mr. Hamilton.] Did William White, the Quaker, act or decline to act as commissioner?—I think I stated before that he acted two years.

10962. Did you ever hear any cause assigned for his declining to act after that period?—I did not.

10963. Did you ever hear that he was afflicted with sore eyes?—He was for some short time. I saw him myself.

10964. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Whatever was the character of the libel against Mr. Strangman, you were present at the trial, and you are clear in your recollection that the judge that tried the case, Chief Baron Joy, pronounced it to be what?—He said it was the most atrocious libel that ever came before him.

10965. Chairman.] Had he tried the other cases of libel?—It was he that tried the case at Waterford, in which Mr. Ronayne was also plaintiff.

10966. It was Chief Baron Joy who expressed that upon Mr. Ronayne's action against Dr. Bell?—Yes.

10967. Did the same judge try the actions against Mr. Hackett?—I am not sure whether it was he or Judge Moore.

10968. Which came first, the action against Dr. Bell, or the actions against Mr. Hackett?—Against Dr. Bell.

10969. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Then you do not recollect that the judge in that action against Mr. Hackett pronounced that libel to be the most atrocious he had ever seen?—He did not.

10970. So

10970. So that both the judge and the jury, in the case of the libel written by Dr. Bell, the jury by their verdict, and the judge by his language from the bench, both concurred in pronouncing it a most atrocious libel?—They did.

10971. And the jury gave a considerably higher verdict in that case than the other jury gave in the case against Mr. Hackett?—They did.

10972. *Chairman.*] Then, in Ireland, both the judges and the juries think that it is a more serious accusation for a man to be accused of being so stupid as to cause the death of his clients, than for a man to be accused of having actually participated in the murder of an individual?—Mr. Strangman was not accused; there was only an allusion made, and the jury thought it alluded to him.

10973. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] So that there was no direct accusation against anyone of having participated in that murder?—There was not; it was only an allusion made; and there were several in Clonmel thought it was another young man alluded to.

10974. But there was no direct charge against any one of having participated in a murder?—There was not.

10975. Whereas, in the other case, there was a direct imputation upon the understanding and capacity of Mr. Ronayne, calculated to destroy his prospects in his profession?—Yes; Mr. Brewster, who was Mr. Ronayne's counsel upon that occasion, said that a more atrocious libel never came before him.

10976. *Chairman.*] Do you set much value upon the assertions of counsel in matters of that kind?—Sometimes I do.

10977. Is not Mr. Brewster a strong politician upon the opposite side?—He is.

10978. *Chairman.*] He is also a member of the learned profession?—He is a very clever man.

10979. And he must feel very much annoyed at the accusation of any counsel causing his clients to be hung by his stupidity?—Mr. Barrister Moore did not feel annoyed at it when he was defending Dr. Bell.

10980. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Do you recollect any more of that libel besides what you have stated; was it long?—It was very long.

10981. Do you recollect anything more of the libel?—Yes; it set him down as a pauper.

10982. Was there any other charge?—I do not exactly remember.

10983. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Do you consider that a charge, calling a man a pauper?—No, I do not.

10984. Did you say that Charles Achison acted or not?—He acted.

10985. How long did he act?—I believe two years.

10986. With respect to Thomas Greer and Thomas Murphy, you stated that they both declined to act?—They did.

10987. Can you state whether they voted or not at the election?—No; Mr. Greer was dead before the late election.

10988. At the preceding one, did he vote?—He did not. There were several that did not vote at the first election.

10989. Thomas Murphy; did he vote?—The day on which Mr. Ronayne was declared to be elected a deputation waited upon Mr. Murphy, to request that he would not vote, and himself and his brewer required an hour to consider and to make up their minds. It appeared that they wanted to consult some person, to see if there was any chance of Mr. Bagwell's being returned; and being brewers, when they found there was no chance of his being returned, they did not vote.

10990. *Chairman.*] What had their being brewers to do with it?—Because it is mostly Roman-catholics that must sell their beer and porter, and there is another establishment in the town.

10991. You mean to say that the Roman-catholics would not have drunk their beer if they had voted on the other side?—I think the shopkeepers that did sell their beer, if they had voted, would not have continued to sell it.

10992. *Mr. Hamilton.*] Do you mean to say that the men that declined voting for fear of losing their Roman-catholic custom, declined acting as commissioners on account of there being Roman-catholics at the board?—I do not know they declined acting as commissioners, but I know they refused to act. Mostly all the persons in Clonmel that are selling beer are Roman-catholics; and those supporting a respectable establishment, such as Mr. Greer's, would expect in return that they should not vote against them. They did not require them to

Mr. Dennis Walsh.
10 May 1837.

vote for them, but they thought they ought to stand neuter, and not to oppose them.

10993. If it was stated that the Protestants who were elected in 1831 refused to act because there was a majority of Roman-catholics on the board, would that be true or false?—I cannot say, but I suppose it was because there was a majority on the board that they refused to act.

10994. Do you think that Mr. Murphy and Mr. Groer refused to act because there was a majority of Roman-catholics on the board?—That is my opinion.

10995. *Mr. Serjeant Bell.*] Do you see any inconsistency in this, that the same gentleman should decline voting at the election against his Roman-catholic customers, lest he should lose their custom, and at the same time should entertain very strong political feelings against Roman-catholics?—No.

10996. And consequently, when an opportunity occurred, give way to those feelings and act accordingly. You see nothing inconsistent between his doing that and the circumstance of his having declined voting at the election in consequence of having been afraid to do so?—No, I do not.

10997. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Is not it just as likely that those gentlemen refused to act from their supposition of the prejudiced state of mind of the members of the board, as much as from their being Roman-catholics?—I do not know; but I know that their first act, though the majority of them were Roman-catholics, was to appoint a Protestant chairman. I heard the greater part of them say that they would be most anxious that the Protestants and Quakers should be of the board.

10998. *Mr. Hawilton.*] Were there any Roman-catholics proposed and rejected in 1831?—I do not know.

10999. Are you aware of the name of any Roman-catholic being proposed and being refused, with yells of disapprobation, at that election?—No.

11000. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Who made out the lists that were supported by Roman-catholics?—Persons were generally named in court; and, as I said before, there were nine Quakers and Protestants passed.

11001. *Mr. Serjeant Bell.*] Do you know the premises of Edward Stevenson, musician?—I do.

11002. Do you know by whom he was registered?—By the late Mr. Hobson.

11003. Do you know, in point of fact, what rent he pays?—The house is worth about 5*l.* I heard that he got it gratis, for the purpose of entitling him to have a vote.

11004. From whom?—Mr. Bagwell.

11005. Is he included at all among the rate-payers?—He is not.

11006. Do you know what evidence was given before Mr. Hobson of the value?—Himself, to prove that it was worth 10*l.* a year; he was rejected the first sessions by Mr. Hobson, and he was admitted after.

11007. After what you have stated, it may be presumed he voted for Mr. Bagwell?—He did.

11008. In point of fact, it does not appear that Edward Stevenson's vote has been at all impugned?—I have not heard that it has been.

11009. So that it comes to this; that premises which in your judgment were not worth more than 5*l.* or 6*l.* a year, and where the claimant was not in the rate-book at all, have been allowed to be of sufficient value by Mr. Hobson, upon his being satisfied, by the evidence of the claimant himself, that the premises were worth 10*l.*?—Yes.

11010. And the conservatives did not object to that, in this instance?—I do not find that they did.

11011. Do you wish to offer any explanation of any other part of your evidence?—An honourable Member asked me what the priests generally did when they spoke to persons; I said they consulted the mayor of the town. I recollect that some short time ago, in Clonmel, where there was a man that kept a house of ill fame, the Catholic clergyman went to him first and advised him to give it up, and if not, they would call him publicly from the altar. They did so, upon the following Sunday, and he still persevered; and then they cautioned their flock not to hold any intercourse with him, and not to go near the man, nor anything else. They are not in the habit of excommunicating.

11012. *Mr. Lefroy.*] This is a power which of course gives them great influence over the conduct of their flock?—It does.

11013. And

11013. And would enable them, to a great extent, to check crime?—It would, of course.

11014. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Do not they use it for the purpose of checking crime?—They do.

11015. To a great extent?—To a great extent. If they hear that there is an improper house in the town, they first go and endeavour to get the persons to give up that way of living; and if they do not, they call them publicly; and if they still persevere, they warn their flock not to have any intercourse with them.

11016. Mr. Lefroy.] Does not the population of the county of Tipperary consist mostly of Roman-catholics?—I cannot say; I do not know the population of the county.

11017. Do you happen to have heard, that within the last three years and a half there were no less than 640 odd murders committed in Tipperary?—I do not believe that; I do not think it is a correct report.

11018. Would you believe it if you found that the grand juries, during that time, had presented for that number of coroners' inquests held upon the bodies of the deceased?—I am one of those that do not mind everything that grand juries would do.

11019. So that although the judge has fined those presentments, and the grand juries upon their oaths have made them, you would not believe them?—I do not say that.

11020. If the fact were that the grand juries had during that time presented, and the judge fined, presentments for coroners for holding inquests upon 640 cases of murder, would you believe the fact then that those murders had taken place?—I could not answer that question, for I know that grand juries do give presentments for persons that die from being found on the road, from cold, and everything else, and those kind of persons being found drowned that got drunk, and that sort of presentments; I have no hesitation in saying that there were not 640 murders committed in the county of Tipperary during the last three years.

11021. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Have you ever heard a distinction between homicide and murder?—I have.

11022. Do not you think it is possible that there may have been a large proportion of homicides committed in the county of Tipperary, and yet that few or none of them may have been, in point of law, murders?—A great many.

11023. Have there been many title outrages in the county of Tipperary within that period?—I do not know of any in the county of Tipperary, on which the grand jury have presented.

11024. Mr. Lefroy.] In every case in which a coroner attends, is there not an inquest by a jury?—There is.

11025. Then that inquest ascertains the cause of the death?—It does.

11026. Then if there were presentments for the coroner, must not the grand juries in those cases have had before them the findings?—They must.

11027. Findings by juries of 12 men?—They must.

11028. Then do you suppose that in those cases the grand juries have presented for the coroner in cases of drowning, or in cases of accidental death, from cold, or any other circumstance, with those verdicts before them?—I have heard so; I have known of several cases of persons found drowned in Clonmel in which presentments were given to the coroner.

11029. As murders?—No; but the coroner got compensation for attending; but I know that persons that were found drowned, who had been seen and proved to be drunk, the coroner did get presentments for them.

11030. If there were 640 presentments by grand juries, and fined by judges, for coroners as for attending inquests in case of murder, would you believe that the number of murders took place?—I would not; I would not believe that 640 murders were committed within the last three years and a half in Tipperary.

11031. Although there must in all those cases have been findings of juries?—Yes.

11032. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Could there have been 640 murders committed within the county of Tipperary within the last three years and a half without your knowing something of it?—No.

11033. Are you aware that the coroner's jury hear evidence upon one side only?—Upon one side only.

11034. And they come to a conclusion, upon hearing one side only, that a murder has been committed or not?—Yes; I have frequently, in the gaol of

Mr. Dennis Ffolkes.

10 May 1837.

Cloamel, seen 40 or 50 persons charged upon the part of the coroner with murder, and I have seen them discharged on proclamation.

11035. Mr. Jeffrey.] For want of prosecution?—At the last assizes I have seen persons who had had a verdict of murder returned against them by the coroner's jury, and the Crown abandoned prosecuting them.

11036. Were there witnesses forthcoming?—There were, and the Crown would not take it up.

11037. Were those murders in the collection of tithes?—No, they were not.

11038. Upon what other occasion?—I cannot say.

11039. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did you ever hear the designation of what are called coroner's murders?—No.

11040. That is to say, cases of homicide, which had been found as murders by the coroner's jury?—Yes, I have heard of such cases as that.

11041. Chairman.] You have said that the Quakers refused to act as commissioners in 1831, because the majority of the commissioners at that period were Roman-catholics?—I did.

11042. Have you stated that one of the Quakers that refused to act was Mr. William White?—No, I did not state that; I did not state that Mr. White refused to act; I stated that Mr. White acted; he acted for two years, and then gave up.

11043. You positively assert that you, upon no former occasion, made that answer to a question that was put to you?—I could not say that, for I knew Mr. White to be the only Quaker in Cloamel that acted.

11044. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But did not he refuse to act after having acted at first?—He did.

11045. Then it is true to a certain extent?—Yes.

11046. Chairman.] You mean to state that the reason why he refused to act was, because there was not a majority of his own party as commissioners?—That was what was generally said; I said that I knew very little about the commissioners, except from reports; that was the reason which I heard induced all the gentlemen, both Protestants and Quakers, not to act.

11047. You have stated that you saw Lord Glengall on the bench at the registry in January last?—I have.

11048. And you have stated that he gave directions to counsel to oppose a man coming up to claim his franchise?—I have.

11049. And you further stated that that man was James Welsh of Garrymore?—I did.

11050. Will you state why you say that Lord Glengall gave instructions to counsel to oppose that man?—Because he was considered to be on the liberal interest; notice was given for him on the liberal side.

11051. What are your grounds for stating that Lord Glengall gave instructions to counsel to oppose James Welsh?—Because I saw Lord Glengall go from the bench where he was sitting near the barrister, and he went over to Counsellor Mulcahy, and Mr. Kellett the attorney, in the conservative interest.

11052. On what bench was Lord Glengall sitting?—Where the barrister sits.

11053. Where were Mr. Mulcahy and Mr. Kellett?—I suppose within three or four yards.

11054. Were they on the same bench, or in the body of the court?—They were in the barrister's box.

11055. And you saw Lord Glengall go from the bench and speak to those gentlemen?—I saw him go and lean over to Mr. Mulcahy and Mr. Kellett.

11056. Did you hear him say anything?—I did not; I was on the other side; I heard him afterwards speak; when he was called on he told a good deal about Welsh to the barrister.

11057. Who?—Lord Glengall.

11058. Did he give evidence upon the subject of James Welsh to the barrister?—No.

11059. Then what did you hear him say?—I do not exactly recollect.

11060. Was that before or after the vote was disallowed?—Before the vote was rejected.

11061. What did he say to the barrister in your hearing?—I do not recollect the words that he said.

11062. What was the purport of his statement?—It was with reference to

the

10 May 1837.

the man. The man charged Lord Glengall's agent with keeping the counterpart of his lease, and I do not know what the reply of Lord Glengall was; he made some observations.

11063. What was the purport of Lord Glengall's observations?—I do not recollect.

11064. Then why do you tell the Committee that you know that he gave Mr. Mulcahy and Mr. Kellett instructions to oppose votes, because you saw him lean over and speak to those gentlemen, and because you heard the observations that he made to the barrister, if you cannot tell what those observations were?—I cannot; but I heard Lord Glengall say that he was not entitled to his franchise, and I heard him say something about the leases.

11065. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did he say that before the man was rejected in open court?—He did.

11066. In the hearing of the barrister?—In the hearing of the barrister, and of every man in court.

11067. *Chairman.*] Will you repeat what you heard him say?—I cannot recollect.

11068. Repeat the purport of it?—It was something about a lease. The man told Lord Glengall that it was a shame for him not to give him his lease, and he applied to his agent, but I cannot tell what he said.

11069. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] But you say the substance of it was, that he was not entitled to his vote?—Yes.

11070. *Chairman.*] What ground have you for saying that he gave instructions to Mr. Mulcahy and Mr. Kellett to oppose the claim?—Because I saw him whispering over to them.

11071. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] Did you see this man come up to register?—Yes.

11072. *Chairman.*] Was it before or after that those observations were made by Lord Glengall to the barrister?—When the man was under cross-examination he was sitting on the left hand side of the barrister, and he went round to the right side of the barrister, and leaned over to Mr. Mulcahy and Mr. Kellett.

11073. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] At the time when Mr. Mulcahy was cross-examining the claimant?—Yes.

11074. And you have no doubt that that was to assist Mr. Mulcahy in his examination?—Yes; every person in court knew it, and many said that it was a shame for Lord Glengall to be there opposing his own tenant; and the man, I recollect, said, "My Lord, you ought not to oppose me, for I supported your father;" and several persons in court said it was a shame for Lord Glengall to be opposing his own tenant.

11075. And you agreed in that?—Yes.

11076. And you are sure that Lord Glengall gave instructions to Mr. Mulcahy and Mr. Kellett to oppose that man's vote?—Yes.

11077. You are sure that they were not going to oppose without those instructions from Lord Glengall?—It was the general opinion in court that he gave them instructions.

11078. What part of the day was it?—In the evening.

11079. How late?—I suppose about four or five o'clock.

11080. Was it light or dark?—It was nearly dark.

11081. How far were you off?—I suppose about three or four yards.

11082. Were you in the body of the court?—I was nearly under the barrister.

11083. Mr. *Lefroy.*] Upon what ground was the man rejected?—Lord Glengall's agent, as well as I recollect, had the counterpart of the man's lease; I believe the man took the benefit of the Act, and the lease was given up in trust to the agent, Mr. Chaytor, and it was kept in the office there.

11084. Was there any question then as to the lease being in existence?—I do not recollect that there was.

11085. Can you say that there was not?—I cannot; I have no recollection of it.

11086. You cannot say that he was rejected upon the ground of having attempted to set up a lease, a life of which had fallen?—As I understood, it was

0.39. in

Mr. Dennis *Valuer.*

in consequence of his not being able to produce the lease that he was not registered.

10 May 1837.

11087. You have no recollection of anything of the sort just alluded to having occurred?—I have not.

Mr. Patrick J. Keily, called in; and further Examined.

Mr. P. J. Keily.

11088. *Chairman.*] YOU stated that the valuation of the town in 1834 was a partial valuation?—Yes.

11089. But that there has been no general valuation since 1828?—No.

11090. At the close of the last day's examination you handed in a list of the houses valued at 10 *l.* in 1828, and the value of which has been altered in the valuation-book subsequently; have you also a list of the houses valued at 5 *l.* in 1828, and altered subsequently?—Yes, I have, this is a list of the number of houses valued at 5 *l.* in 1828, the value of which has been altered in the valuations subsequently. [*The Witness delivered in the same.*]

11091. Have you also a list of the houses of 20 *l.* and upwards which have been altered?—I have a list of the number of houses valued at 20 *l.* and upwards, the valuation of which has been altered in the valuation books subsequently.

[*The Witness delivered in the same.*]

11092. It appears from this return that three houses of the value of 5 *l.* in 1828 have been re-valued, and the valuation altered since that period?—Not revalued; the valuation has been altered; the premises were discharged from the payment of the lamp and watch tax.

11093. By what commissioners was that done?—By the commissioners in 1831 and 1834.

11094. All those three cases have been discharged from any payment whatever?—Yes.

11095. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Was their being discharged from the lamp and watch tax the reason for their being discharged from any payment whatever?—Yes.

11096. Why were they discharged from the lamp and watch tax?—Because they were deteriorated in value since 1828.

11097. It was by reason of the deterioration in the value of those premises that they were discharged from the rate?—Yes.

11098. *Chairman.*] These the only house of the value of 10 *l.* of which the valuation has been altered since 1828, is Patrick Scully's house, which was reduced in 1831 to 7 *l.*?—Yes.

11099. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Was not the cause of that reduction a deterioration in the value of the premises after 1828?—It was.

11100. It was because the premises were reduced in value subsequently to the valuation in 1828 that the 10 *l.* was reduced to 7 *l.* in 1831?—It was.

11101. *Chairman.*] There appear to have been alterations in the valuation of houses of 20 *l.* and upwards; in the case of Matthew Scully, who is altered from 30 *l.* to 35 *l.*; Thomas O'Connell, who is altered from 35 *l.* to 40 *l.*; Smith and Fisher, altered from 45 *l.* to 50 *l.*; John Miles, from 18 *l.* to 20 *l.*; in all those instances the value has been increased?—It has been increased in consequence of improvements in the premises since 1828.

11102. And that was the cause of the valuation being raised?—It was. That list includes the premises of Mr. Pedder and several others.

11103. Mr. *Hamilton.*] How do you know that it was only in consequence of improvements?—Because there was a valuator employed for the purpose of taking the value of houses that were built since 1828 to 1831, and houses that were improved, and his valuation sworn to.

11104. Then his instructions were merely to take improvements and new buildings into consideration?—His instructions were to take into account houses that were built and houses that were improved in value.

11105. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] And it was upon his evidence that the commissioners proceeded in raising the amount of the valuation?—Upon his sworn valuations both in 1831 and 1834.

11106. *Chairman.*] In like manner Lyons has been increased from 40 *l.* to 50 *l.* and Edward Smith from 23 *l.* to 30 *l.*?—Yes.

11107. What do you mean by saying that John Noonan, of Main-street, two houses.

houses, one at 28*l.*, the second at 12*l.*, is altered to 40*l.*?—Because those premises are improved.

11108. What do you mean by saying the second house at 12*l.*; do you mean to say that that has been altered?—The premises were divided, and both were made equal, and now the valuation is 20*l.* for each, whereas before that valuation took place it was 28*l.* in one instance and 12*l.* in the other.

11109. Then although, in point of fact, he pays upon the same rated value, he pays more on account of the difference of the rate levied upon him?—He does.

11110. And therefore it was an object to him to keep his premises, the one at 28*l.*, and the other at 12*l.*, instead of having them both at 20*l.*?—I think not; because it increased the other house in point of rent.

11111. If he has now to pay upon 40*l.* a higher rate of charge, and before he had to pay upon 12*l.* a lower rate of charge, is not he worse off?—He pays himself the taxes rated upon one house of 20*l.*, and the tenant pays taxes rated at 20*l.* next door to him.

11112. Now as to James Fleming, his house was at 28*l.*, and now it is at 70*l.*; and Wood & Co.'s was at 40*l.*, it is now at 45*l.*?—Yes; Mr. Fleming has made considerable improvements in his premises.

11113. John Duane, Johnson-street, 10*l.*, altered to 15*l.*?—Yes.

11114. Counsellor Mulcahy, 20*l.*, now 30*l.*?—Yes.

11115. Edward Jones, house and premises, 25*l.*, altered to 30*l.*?—Yes.

11116. All those persons have had their premises valued higher than they were formerly?—Yes; in consequence of improvements.

11117. Are any of those commissioners?—Yes, Mr. Lyons is.

11118. Then Mr. Bianconi's house was at 60*l.*, and it is now reduced to 40*l.* and to 46*l.*?—Mr. Bianconi, in 1828, lived at the house that is valued at 60*l.*; he subsequently left it, and the house that is valued there at 46*l.* is now occupied by one Daniel Hern; it is an hotel; the premises at the rear of the house were built by Mr. Bianconi, offices and stabling, both of which were valued separately.

11119. Thomas Davis, Market-street, 30*l.*, now pays 15*l.* for each store?—Upon three occupied by one Joseph Sparrow & Co.; there are three distinct premises now.

11120. Then John Murphy, 40*l.*, now 60*l.*?—Yes.

11121. George Graham, 100*l.*, altered to 105*l.*?—Yes.

11122. And Henry Pedder was 110*l.*, and is now 118*l.*?—Yes.

11123. Was not it stated by you, on a former occasion, that Henry Pedder had not been valued at all in 1828?—No, it was not; Mr. Pedder was valued in 1828 at 110*l.*; but, in consequence of improvements subsequently made, the valuation was raised to 118*l.*

11124. It appears, therefore, from this return, that in all the cases of the higher class of houses, the alterations which have been made have been made upon the ground of improvements, and higher valuations have been put upon them?—Yes.

11125. But with regard to the lower class of houses of 10*l.* and below 10*l.*, wherever an alteration has been made, it has been by way of reduction?—By reduction.

11126. Mr. Serjeant *Boll.*] Is it the fact that in no instance has the valuation of any house of 10*l.* or under 10*l.* been increased since 1828?—I believe not; I do not recollect any instance.

11127. Is there any instance of a house, valued in 1828 under 20*l.* having been increased?—There is the case of James Dunne; I believe it was valued, in 1828, at 10*l.*, and which was increased to 15*l.* in consequence of improvements he made on the premises; I did not recollect that instance at the moment; and there is also the case of John Millea.

11128. With the exception of the case of John Millea and James Dunne, do you remember any instance of any house valued under 20*l.* in 1828 which has since been increased?—I do not. I should observe, that yesterday I had not time to look over the valuations made in 1831; but there are houses built in 1831, and improved, that are not included in that list.

11129. Do you mean to say that there are some houses built, and some houses improved since 1828, which were not included in that return?—Yes.

11130. *Chairman.*] Have you any other cases of houses valued in 1828 at

Mr. P. J. Kealy,
10 May 1837.

20*l.* and upwards, of which the valuation has since been altered?—Yes; I find that in the book of 1828 a house was occupied by the police, valued at 45 *l.* in 1828, and in 1831 it was valued at 50 *l.*

11131. Who is it occupied by now?—By Mason & Company. I find that there are four houses, in hook 1831, namely, Thomas Lawlor, Patrick Fenwick, Cornelius Cahill and Johanna Daniel; those are the property of Mr. Lawlor. They were built since 1828; they were built within the last three years.

11132. Mr. Serjeant *Bell.*] Have you any other cases?—There is the case of William Tinsley, a builder, a yard and workshop; that is increased in value from 5*l.* to 8*l.* John Marshall's house, in Dublin-street, was valued at 10*l.* in 1828; and it was, in consequence of improvements, valued at 16*l.* in 1831.

11133. *Chairman.*] Are there any other instances?—No other instances that I see.

11134. You have stated altogether about 25 or 26 instances in which alterations have been made; that being the case, it may be assumed that the commissioners look very sharply after the valuation of the houses, to see that they are properly rated?—They do.

11135. In those cases which you have mentioned, where the value has been increased, are the parties occupying those premises which have been so increased of different opinions in politics?—In some cases, I suppose so.

11136. Are they or are they not all of one way of thinking?—Not at all; there are Catholics and Protestants.

11137. Is Mr. Bianconi a conservative?—No; Mr. Bianconi is a commissioner, and a Roman-catholic.

11138. And Mr. Lyons?—And Mr. Lyons.

11139. Therefore, it appears that the commissioners have, without regard to party, altered the value of houses?—Certainly.

11140. And they have also altered the value of houses of various classes?—Yes.

11141. Chiefly the upper class?—Chiefly the upper class.

11142. Because in the upper class of houses improvements have been made more extensively than in the lower class?—Yes, I believe so.

11143. Is the number of houses of the value of 5*l.* and under 10*l.*, and of 10*l.* and under 20*l.*, greater than the number of houses of 20*l.* and upwards?—I should think it is; I think that the premises are more numerous rating from 10*l.* to 20*l.* and from 5*l.* to 10*l.*, than they are above 20*l.*

11144. Is not the class between 5*l.* and 10*l.* much more numerous than the class from 10*l.* upwards?—I believe not.

11145. Is it more numerous than between 10*l.* and 20*l.*?—I believe the classes between 10*l.* and 20*l.* and between 5*l.* and 10*l.* are pretty much alike in number.

11146. But the two together are much greater than from 20*l.* and upwards?—I believe so.

11147. But much the greater proportion of alterations have been in the class of houses of 20*l.* and upwards?—Yes.

11148. Those have been made with an anxiety to get the proper value on the books upon which the rate is to be made?—I should think so.

11149. In the case, for instance, of Mr. George Graham, the commissioners made a difference in a 100*l.* house of 5*l.* in value; they raised him from 100*l.* to 105*l.*?—Yes.

11150. Therefore they calculated pretty nearly the value of the houses within five per cent.?—I should observe that they were guided by the sworn valuations made by the valutors employed by the commissioners.

11151. They consider it worth their while to alter houses, even in the small proportion of from 100*l.* to 105*l.*?—In all cases where improvements are made the valuator has had directions to go and value them.

11152. And they think it worth while to alter a house from 110*l.* to 118*l.*, as in the case of Mr. Pedder?—Yes.

11153. The result of all this is, that the commissioners have been looking very sharply after the value of the houses?—Where improvements have been made the valutors have directions to take them into account.

11154. Then they have made no distinction between the different classes of houses; wherever they have observed the lower classes of houses, namely, of 5*l.*, 8*l.*, or 10*l.* improved, they have increased the valuation?—If such improvements

improvements were made, the valuation would be increased in those cases as well as in others.

11155. Then as you have stated that so small a number of houses have had an alteration made in their valuation in the commissioners' books, the conclusion is, that the commissioners have not thought that any great alteration in the general character of houses of the above value has been made since the period of the first valuation in 1828?—I believe it is the opinion of the commissioners that there has not been any great alterations.

11156. And the object of the commissioners has been to make all parties occupying houses liable to rates pay up to the full value of those houses, both in 1831 and in 1834?—The object of the commissioners is, to make them pay the taxes rated upon those houses.

11157. Is it their object to spare one class, and thereby to burden another, more than they justly ought to be burdened?—By no means.

11158. They are desirous that they shall all pay what the Act of Parliament states they shall pay?—Yes.

11159. Upon the full value of the house?—Of course, as valued by the valuers.

11160. Mr. Serjeant *Bell*.] But they assume the valuation of 1828 to have been correct at the time?—They do.

11161. And wherever they have made alterations it has been only where either improvements or deteriorations have taken place?—In no other case, except a few appeals.

11162. Mr. *Houston*.] As clerk to the commissioners you record the minutes of the meetings of the commissioners?—I do.

11163. Have you your minute-book here?—No.

11164. In that minute-book are the names of the commissioners that attend at each meeting recorded?—Yes.

11165. From your general knowledge, can you state whether Mr. Labarte acted pretty regularly as commissioner from 1831 up to the next election?—I am sure he did, because he was elected chairman in 1831.

11166. Richard Vowell; what do you say as to him?—Richard Vowell attended some of the meetings of the commissioners, but he subsequently resigned; he came to the board and apologized, stating that he could not well attend.

11167. Can you state when that took place?—I cannot, in the absence of the minute-book.

11168. Can you state about when?—I cannot; I believe it was in the first year.

11169. Should you be surprised if you were told that he acted as commissioner for three years?—My impression is that he did not; I cannot be accurate in the absence of the minute-book, but I am almost certain that he did not.

11170. Were you directed to bring the minute-book with you here?—No, I was not; if I was, I would have brought it.

11171. Were you present when Mr. William White, the Quaker, resigned?—He tendered his resignation. I think he was ill; he had sore eyes. I waited upon him at his house, and he said to me, "Friend Keily, I do not think I can attend, for I am confined to my house several days in consequence of a sore eye," and he subsequently resigned.

11172. Then the reason of his resigning was, as he alleged, his having sore eyes?—Yes, and that he was then in delicate health.

11173. Did Mr. Charles Achison act for the three years?—I think he did; but in the absence of the minute-book I am not positive.

11174. Can you recollect whether or not he resigned?—I believe he declined to act some time prior to the termination of the three years.

11175. Mr. George Glasscot; can you state the reason why he declined to act?—I cannot.

11176. Are you aware of his state of health at the period when he resigned?—I should suppose he was in good health when he resigned.

11177. Did you ever hear that he was in a precarious state of health and not able to attend?—I cannot say that I ever heard so.

11178. Mr. Thomas Greer; he is a Quaker?—Yes; he is dead.

11179. Did he act up to the time of his death?—He did not; he did not act at all.

Mr. P. J. Kelly.

10 May 1871.

11180. Did he assign any reason for not acting?—Not to my knowledge.
11181. Did you ever hear it stated that the gentlemen of the commissioners who are Protestants declined acting because the majority were Roman-catholics?—No.
11182. Was there at the board much collision between the Protestant and the Roman-catholic parties?—None.
11183. Were you present at the election of 1831?—I was in court.
11184. Was there much excitement; were there placards; or was there much popular feeling manifested at the election?—There seemed to be a good deal of commotion about it; I knew very little of the business at that time; it was subsequently I was appointed clerk.
11185. Can you state whether any respectable Roman-catholics were proposed as commissioners upon that occasion who were rejected, and rejected with marks of disapprobation by the rate-payers?—I cannot.
11186. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] You were present, and you saw no such thing?—I do not recollect it.
11187. If such a thing had occurred, would not it have remained in your recollection?—I think so; there was a great deal of noise and confusion in the court.
11188. Mr. Hamilton.] Did you see any placards accusing the former commissioners of anything?—There were placards posted about the town; I saw one placard when walking through the town, and I paid little attention to it.
11189. Do you know what the substance of that placard was?—I do not know what it was; I dare say the purport of it must have been to call the rate-payers to assemble at the court-house, as there were a new body of commissioners to be chosen.
11190. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] It was merely a requisition convening the rate-payers?—It was something to that effect; it was giving them public notice.
11191. Mr. Lefroy.] But no expression of approbation or disapprobation of any particular persons or classes of persons?—I do not recollect; I paid very little attention to the reading of the document; I do not recollect what it contained.
11192. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] If it had contained any expression of disapprobation of the former commissioners, do not you think you would recollect it?—I think I would.
11193. Mr. Lefroy.] If you did not take any particular notice of it, why should you say you would have recollected it?—That is, if I had read it attentively.
11194. Mr. Serjeant Ball.] If you read it, if it had contained any disapprobation of the former commissioners, do not you think you would have recollected it?—If I had read the document attentively, but I read it cursorily; therefore I have no recollection of what it contained.
11195. Then you cannot tell what it contained, but your impression is, that it was merely a requisition to the rate-payers to meet?—I think so.
11196. Mr. Hamilton.] There were nine Protestants elected commissioners in 1831?—There were three Quakers Mr. Malcomson refused in court, Mr. Moore Labarte, Mr. James Burke, Mr. Vowell, Mr. Nicholas Fell, Mr. George Glasscot, Mr. Charles Achison.
11197. Was not Mr. William White a Protestant?—He was a Quaker, and Thomas Greer a Quaker, and Thomas Murphy a Quaker.
11198. Chairman.] Do not you call a Quaker a Protestant?—No; nor do I call a Protestant a Quaker; there is another distinction too, namely, Presbyterians.
11199. Is not a Presbyterian a Protestant?—I do not know.
11200. Mr. Hamilton.] Then, according to your account, there were nine Protestants elected commissioners in 1831, who were not Roman-catholics?—Nine; three Quakers and six Protestants.
11201. And you say that they went on harmoniously at the board?—Yes.
11202. And there are no Protestants on the board now, except the mayor, who is, *ex-officio*, a member of the present board?—No.
11203. Were there any Protestants elected at the last election in 1831?—I believe not; I do not think they attended the court.
11204. Mr. Lefroy.] Is it necessary, in order to be elected, that they should attend the court?—Not necessary; they may be elected by the rate-payers in their absence.

11205. 1834 was the last election?—It was.
 11206. When was the preceding election?—In 1834.
 11207. Has there been an election this year?—No; there will be an election on the first Monday of July next.
 11208. What amount of rates is paid by Mr. Malcomson?—To the amount of about 25*l.*
 11209. What is the whole amount to be levied?—£.784. 19*s.* 6½*d.*

Mr. John Butler, called in; and Examined.

11210. *Chairman.*] WHERE do you live?—In Clonmel.
 11211. In what street?—In Main-street.
 11212. What are you?—A woollen-draper.
 11213. Have you been there many years?—A good many years; I believe six or seven-and-twenty years.
 11214. Mr. Serjeant *Bull.*] Did you act in concurrence and in company with Mr. Walshe in valuing certain premises in Clonmel?—I did.
 11215. You went to the premises for the purpose?—I did.
 11216. How long was this before you came over here?—About a fortnight.
 11217. Had you also employed yourself in valuing any of the premises at the time of the petition of Mr. Bagwell, in the year 1838?—I had not; I had nothing to do with that valuation.
 11218. Did Mr. Lonergan accompany you?—He did upon the last occasion, for a short time.
 11219. Did you make memorandums of the particulars of the valuation as you went along?—I did.
 11220. Mr. Walshe did so likewise?—I believe he did in some instances.
 11221. Each took separate memorandums?—We had separate books, and each took separate memorandums.
 11222. And each formed his judgment separately?—Separately and collectively also; if there was any difference as to the value, we consulted each other.
 11223. If you did not all agree as to the value?—Yes; and ultimately we agreed.

11224. Do you mean to say that in every instance you came to an agreement?—No; we did not consult each other in every instance.

11225. But in every instance in which you did consult each other, did you come to a correct opinion as to the value?—We did.

11226. But there were instances in which you did not consult each other?—There were.

11227. Is there any instance in which the valuation made by all three did not concur?—I do not know that there is any instance in which we did not concur.

11228. Do not you know that some one or two of you considered premises as being of the value of 10*l.*, which some other one or two did not consider of the value of 10*l.*?—Yes; there might be some instances.

11229. In point of fact, were there any instances in which you, for instance, valued a house or houses at 10*l.*, in which Mr. Walshe did not think they were of so high a value?—I think there were a few; I think there was a cellar or two.

11230. And in like manner, Mr. Lonergan, in some instances, did not agree?—Certainly, there were a few instances that we disagreed upon.

11231. Do you know the premises of Timothy Dooly, in Dispensary-street?—I do.

11232. Did you examine them with a view to an improved valuation?—I did.

11233. Do you know the rent that the tenant pays for them?—£. 8. 10*s.*, I believe, is the rent.

11234. What do you consider the value of those premises?—The house is a slated comfortable house, with a snug yard to it; there are three rooms in it that are set to lodgers, and there is a back-house; and I think, altogether, it is worth 10*l.* a year.

11235. Have you any doubt that if the tenant wished now to part with them, he could get 10*l.* a year for them?—I have not; I think he would readily get 10*l.* a year.

11236. Do you know the premises of Michael Russell, in Dispensary-street?—I do.

Mr. John Butler.

10 May 1837.

11237. What do you say as to the value of his premises?—They are equally as valuable as the others; I have no doubt he could get the same for them.
11238. You have no doubt that if Russell wished now to part with his interest he would get 10*l.* a year for them?—None whatever; he has got a garden, which the other house has not.
11239. Do you know the premises of Napper?—Yes; Napper is in the same street.
11240. Is his house as valuable as Russell's?—I think it is; they are all the same.
11241. Do you know that, in point of fact, Napper was registered by Mr. Hobson?—I do not know; I did not attend closely to the registry.
11242. You are aware that Napper is on the registry?—I heard that he was.
11243. You never heard any objection made to the value of his premises?—No, I did not hear that his house was questioned at all as to value.
11244. Paul Winbury's house?—I know his house.
11245. What do you take to be the value of that house?—That house is certainly worth 10*l.* a year; it is a good house, with a yard and slaughterhouse; he is a butcher.
11246. Do you know Thomas Hill's house, in Upper Johnson-street?—I do; that is also a good house, with a very neat garden, and I have no hesitation in saying it is worth 10*l.*
11247. Lawrence Cashin, in Upper Johnson-street; do you know that house?—I do; I was in it.
11248. What should you say as to the value of that house?—It is worth 10*l.*; there is a shop to that house; it is in a good part of the town for his business, and there is a yard and a pigsty.
11249. Have you any doubt that 10*l.* a year could be got for that if he wished to part with his interest?—None whatever.
11250. William Browne, in Upper Johnson-street; do you know his house?—I do. Browne's is not quite so valuable, but it is certainly worth 10*l.* a year; the man told me that he intended leaving Clonmel, and he was offered 10*l.* a year, and I think a fine of 5*l.*, but I am not certain as to that; but he told me that he could get 10*l.* a year for it from a person in his own trade.
11251. Jeremiah Myers's house, in Upper Johnson-street; do you know that?—I do. That is a very good house; a very comfortable house, well calculated for his trade; he is a butcher; he has a yard and slaughterhouse.
11252. Is your evidence the same as to the value of that house?—That is a better house; he has ground to the rear of his house.
11253. A sheep stand?—It was formerly a garden, but latterly he found it more profitable to convert it into a stand for sheep.
11254. Have you any doubt that 10*l.* could be got for that house if the tenant wished to part with it?—Not the smallest.
11255. Edmund Day, in Upper Johnson-street?—I know that house.
11256. Have you any doubt that 10*l.* could be got for that?—No.
11257. John Bagg, in Upper Johnson-street; what do you say as to those premises?—His premises are worth 10*l.* a year.
11258. That is to say, the tenant would get 10*l.* a year for them if he wished to part with them?—I think he would.
11259. Do you know Daniel English, in Upper Johnson-street?—I do; English's house is not so good as those that we have been speaking of.
11260. Do you consider it of the value of 10*l.*?—I think it is; I do not think it is worth 10*l.* a year as it stands.
11261. Do you think that if the tenant wished to leave it he could get 10*l.* a year?—There is part of it let; and the use of the part he occupies himself and the part that is let is worth 10*l.* a year.
11262. Mr. *Lefroy*.] Has he let it by the year?—I suppose by the year.
11263. How long has that been so?—As long as I recollect the house.
11264. Was it so when he registered?—I should say that it was.
11265. Is the part that he retains worth 10*l.* a year?—No, the part that he retains is not worth 10*l.* a year.
11266. Mr. Serjeant *Bolt*.] Mr. George Graham, in question 5030, is asked, "With respect to English, do you happen to know that English had a lease of those premises?—I do not, but I have heard it stated by other people that English's place was not worth more than 3*l.*, though I set a higher value upon it."

it." He is then asked, "But you think the utmost value of the two houses was 5*l.* each?—I do." Do you observe there that George Graham admits that the two houses were worth 5*l.* each, that is to say, that they were worth together 10*l.*?—Yes.

11267. You have stated that you did not consider English's house as valuable as the other?—Yes, as Myers's, or Day's, or Bagg's.

11268. And yet you find that George Graham considers that to be worth 10*l.*?—Yes.

11269. Does that contribute to strengthen the opinion you have formed as to the value of the other premises you have been examined about, when you find Graham admitting these premises, which you considered not so valuable as those, to be worth 10*l.*?—Not a doubt of it.

11270. Do you know Thomas Boyd's, in Duckett-street?—I do.

11271. What do you consider the value of those premises?—He pays 8*l.* a year, Irish; it is a very good house, with a yard and a pig-house, and the lodgings produce him 4*s.* 6*d.* a week, and upon the whole I think the house is worth 10*l.* a year.

11272. You deliberately come to the conclusion, that Thomas Boyd, if he wished to part with those premises, could get 10*l.* a year for them; is that your opinion?—It is.

11273. Do you know the premises that were occupied by Patrick Hickey, in Duckett-street?—Yes; it is nearly the same as Boyd's.

11274. Then your evidence is, that those premises are worth 10*l.* a year?—They pay the same rent, and they are the same description of houses.

11275. John Ryan, of Duckett-street; do you know his premises?—I do; they are nearly of the same value; they belong to Dr. Burgis, and they pay the same rent.

11276. John Everard, of Bagwell-street; what do you say to that?—That is a good house; it is worth 10*l.* a year; he built a back house; he is a miller by trade.

11277. Have you any doubt that 10*l.* a year would he got for that house?—None whatever.

11278. Do you know Patrick Burke's house, in Dispensary-street?—I do; he has a very snug house and garden, yard and back house, and he sets lodgings.

11279. Would you consider 10*l.* a year too much for those premises?—I think they are worth 10*l.* a year.

11280. Do you know Martin Callaghan's house, in New-street?—That man is dead; I know the house; I cannot say much for it; I would not say that it was worth anything like 10*l.*

11281. What do you say to Thomas Walsh's, in New-street?—I should not think that is worth 10*l.*; it is a forge.

11282. James Glisson, in Cashel-road?—That is a very comfortable house, and nice garden; he has improved that place very much, and built houses upon it; he has three or four houses, built by himself.

11283. Would you consider that house worth 10*l.* a year?—I would.

11284. You have no doubt that if that house was to be parted with by the tenant he would get that for it?—I have not.

11285. Do you know Thomas Kelly's, in Gravel-walk?—I do.

11286. What is your judgment as to the value of those premises?—They are not so good as those I have been speaking of.

11287. Would you consider 10*l.* too much for those?—I would.

11288. Do you know Nicholas Lynch's, in Gravel-walk?—I do.

11289. What do you say as to the value of his house?—I would not say that it would be worth 10*l.* a year, though he has acquired property there, and is a very proper man; he told me he would not leave it if he was offered 10*l.* a year for it; it is a good situation for his business.

11290. But in estimating the value of houses, you do not take into account that the man has made money there?—No; but whether a man would give 10*l.* a year for it.

11291. Do you know James Gleeson, in Gravel-walk?—I do.

11292. What do you say to that?—That is a large slated house; he sets lodgings; he has a small garden in the rear.

11293. Would you consider that worth 10*l.* a year?—Not as it stands.

Mr. John Butler.

20 May 1837.

11294. Do you know how it stood in 1831?—I do; pretty much the same.
11295. Then you doubt whether it was worth 10 *l.* a year then?—If you take the lodgings into account, I think it might be said to be worth 10 *l.* a year.
11296. Then there is Richard Butler, in Gravel-walk; what do you say as to his house?—The same as Gleeson's; if you take the lodgings into account, I think it would be worth 10 *l.* a year.
11297. What do you say to Timothy Carey's house?—I cannot say much for that; I was in it, and examined it; I do not think any man would give 10 *l.* a year for it.
11298. What do you say to Martin Morony's, in New-street?—I cannot say much for that house; I do not think any person would give 10 *l.* a year for it.
11299. John Hennessy, in Hopkins'-lane; what do you say to that?—That is a very bad house; it is not worth 10 *l.*; it is in a very bad state.
11300. John O'Flanagan, in White's-lane; what do you say to that?—He occupies a couple of rooms in the house.
11301. What is the value of the house?—The house altogether is worth 10 *l.* a year; but he does not occupy it; he is a lodger.
11302. Has he an exclusive right to the entrance?—I do not know that he has.
11303. *Mr. Lefroy.*] Is the part that he occupies worth 10 *l.* a year?—I do not think that it is.
11304. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] John O'Brien, in Hopkins'-lane; what do you say to his premises?—I do not know them.
11305. Jacob Barden, in Hopkins'-lane?—I would not say that was worth 10 *l.* a year.
11306. Walter Bowles, in Upper Johnson-street?—I cannot say much for that.
11307. *Chairman.*] When you use the expression, "I cannot say much for that," you mean the Committee to understand that, in your opinion, that house is not of the value of 10 *l.*?—That is what may be inferred from what I say.
11308. *Mr. Serjeant Ball.*] Do you know Michael Murphy's, in Upper Johnson-street?—I do.
11309. What do you say as to that house?—That is pretty much the same as Bowles's; it is next door to it.
11310. Then you would not say that that is worth 10 *l.*?—I would not.
11311. Do you know Bartholomew Fennessy's house, in Irishtown?—I do.
11312. What do you say as to the value of that house?—I think that house worth 10 *l.* a year.
11313. If the tenant wanted to part with his interest, he could get 10 *l.* a year for it?—I think so; it is in front of the street in Irishtown.
11314. John Collins, of Sherlock's-lane; do you know his premises?—I do.

APPENDIX.

LIST OF APPENDIX.

APPENDIX (A.)

- No. 1.—A Return of the Number of Voters Registered in each County in Ireland, since the 1st October 1832, distinguishing them into Classes of 50*l.* Freeholders, 20*l.* Leaseholders, 20*l.* Freeholders, 10*l.* Leaseholders, and 10*l.* Freeholders; distinguishing the Date of the Registry of each - - - - - p. 1
- No. 2.—A Return of the Number of Voters Registered in each County of a City or Town in Ireland since the passing of the Irish Reform Act, distinguishing the Voters into the Classes of Freeholders, Rent-charges, Leaseholders, Householders and Freemen, with the Date of their Registrations respectively - - - - - p. 40
- No. 3.—A Return of the several Persons Registered in the several Boroughs in Ireland, sending Members to Parliament, who have subscribed their Affidavits for Registry as Members - - - - - p. 45

APPENDIX (B.)

- No. 1.—A Return of the Name, Residence and Description of each Person admitted as a Freeman in each Corporation in Ireland (except Dublin) since March 1831, with the Date of Admission and the Date of Registration of each, together with a Statement of the Right under which each was admitted - - - - - p. 57
- No. 2.—Further Returns of Freeman admitted into Corporations in Ireland since March 1831 - p. 70

APPENDIX (C.)

- A Return of the Number of Rentcharges Registered at each Session since the 1st October 1832, stating the Name and Residence of each Person so Registered, the Barony and Denomination of Land on which the Charge was granted, and the Name of the Person granting the same; distinguishing the 50*l.* from the 20*l.* Rentcharges - - - - - p. 94

APPENDIX (D.)

- A Return of the Deputy Assistant Barristers appointed under the Authority of the 2 & 3 WIL. IV. c. 88, s. 65; the Names and Dates of the Appointment of all Assistant Barristers appointed since the 1st January 1833, and the Causes of the Vacancies which may have been thus supplied; the Names and Dates of the Removals of all the Assistant Barristers who may have been removed from one County to another since the 1st January 1833; also specifying the Places to which they may have been removed - - - - - p. 120

APPENDIX (E.)

- A Return of the Number of Notices of Applications at each Registering Session, since the passing of the Irish Reform Act, to register Voters in each County, City and Town in Ireland, together with the Number of such Claimants, admitted, rejected, or withdrawn, distinguishing the same into Classes, and in Cases of Rejection, the Number of Decisions of the Assistant or Registering Barristers appealed against, the Grounds of Appeal, and the Judgment thereon - - - - - p. 127

APPENDIX (F.)

- A Return of the Number and Names of Freeman Registered as Voters in the City of Dublin, since the passing of the Reform Act for Ireland, with the Date of the Registry of each Voter, and the Date of the first Day of the Registry Sessions at which each Freeman was Registered; and also a Return of the Date of the Notice for Registry of each such Registered Voter - - - - - p. 130

APPENDIX (G.)

- A Return of the several Houses in the Towns in Ireland, which return Members to serve in Parliament; specifying the Streets in which each is situated, its Number, and the Name of the Occupier; together with the Annual Value of each, as estimated and returned by the Valuers appointed to make the annual Apportionment of Rates and Taxes for Municipal purposes, either under the provisions of the Act 9 Geo. 4. c. 89, or of any Local or Private Acts passed for the Regulation of these Towns, or of the new Valuation Act, where it has come into operation - - - - - p. 135

APPENDIX (H.)

- A Return of the Names and Residences, with the Streets and Numbers of the Houses, of all Persons in Towns in Dublin Collection, which return Members to serve in Parliament, who have made application for or received Excise Licences for the Sale of Spirits in Premises under the Annual Value of Ten Pounds, since 1st October 1832 - - - - - p. 139

APPENDIX.

— (A.) —

My Lord,

Dublin Castle, 17th March 1837.

REFERRING to the Orders of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Fictitious Votes, Ireland, dated 14th February 1837, I am commanded by the Lord Lieutenant to transmit herewith the undermentioned Returns, which have been prepared for the purpose of being laid before the Committee, viz.:

1. Return of the Number of Voters Registered in each County in Ireland since 1st October 1832.
2. Return of the Number of Notices of Applications at each Registering Sessions since the passing of the Irish Reform Act, &c.
3. Return of the Number of Rent-charges registered since the 1st October 1832, &c.

Lord G. C. H. Somerset,
 &c. &c. &c.

I have, &c.
 T. Drummond.

Appendix (A.)

— No. 1. —

A RETURN of the Number of VOTERS REGISTERED in each County in Ireland, since the 1st October 1832, distinguishing them into Classes of 50 l. Freeholders, 20 l. Leaseholders, 20 l. Freeholders, 10 l. Leaseholders and 10 l. Freeholders; distinguishing the Date of the Registry of each.

No. 1.
 Voters Registered
 in Counties.

SCHEDULE.

Astrin.	Donegal.	King's County.	Roscommon.
Armagh.	Down.	Limerick County.	Sligo.
Culow.	Dublin.	Londonderry.	Tipperary.
Cavan.	Fermanagh.	Longford.	Tyrone.
Clare.	Galway.	Louth.	Waterford.
Cork.	Kilkenny.	Queen's County.	

Returns to this Order are still outstanding from the following Counties:—Kerry, Kildare, Leitrim, Mayo, Meath, Monaghan, Westmeath, Wexford and Wicklow.

ANTRIM.

Number Registered.	£. 50 Freehold.	£. 20 Leasehold.	£. 20 Freehold.	£. 10 Leasehold.	£. 10 Freehold.
4,069	649	87	474	403	2,455

Period of registry from 1st October 1832 to 6th January 1837.

Note.—Mr. Davens, in extracting the foregoing return from the records, was several days employed in making it out; but if the dates of each registry be required, it would require some weeks to make it out from 24 biennial books.

16 March 1837.

S. Davens, Clerk of the Peace.

ARMAGH.

DATE OF REGISTRY.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 20 Freeholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	£. 20 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Leaseholders.	£. 20 Freeholders.
At first sessions under Reform Act, 27 December 1832	246	259	2,261	101	469	5
Lurgan - 27 Dec. 1833	-	-	7	-	-	-
Ballybet - 3 Jan. 1833	-	-	23	-	3	-
Armagh - 1 April	-	-	2	3	-	-
Market-hill 10 April	-	-	4	-	-	-

630.

*

(continued)

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
 Voters Registered
 in Counties.

DATE OF REGISTRY.	£. 50	£. 20	£. 10	£. 00	£. 10	£. 20
	Freeholders.	Freeholders.	Freeholders.	Leaseholders.	Leaseholders.	Leaseholders.
Lurgan - 18 June 1833	-	-	-	-	1	-
Armagh - 16 Oct. -	1	-	-	2	2	-
Market-hill 25 Oct. -	-	-	-	-	-	3
Lurgan - 30 Dec. -	1	-	-	-	-	-
Armagh - 31 March 1834	2	1	15	-	-	2
Market-hill 8 April -	2	-	-	-	-	-
Lurgan - 18 June -	1	-	-	-	-	-
Ballyhot - 24 June -	-	1	4	-	-	-
Armagh - 15 Oct. -	2	-	-	-	-	-
Market-hill 24 Oct. -	2	1	4	-	-	-
Lurgan - 30 Dec. -	4	2	-	-	-	-
Ballybot - 5 Jan. 1835	7	1	3	-	-	2
Armagh - 28 March -	6	1	2	2	-	3
Market-hill 7 April -	2	1	7	-	-	5
Lurgan - 23 June -	1	1	-	-	-	-
Ballybot - 29 June -	2	3	4	-	-	-
Armagh - 14 Oct. -	1	-	1	-	-	2
Market-hill 23 Oct. -	-	3	2	-	-	-
Lurgan - 29 Dec. -	-	1	5	-	-	-
Ballybot - 4 Jan. 1836	3	3	3	-	-	2
Armagh - 30 March -	-	-	2	-	-	-
Market-hill 8 April -	-	1	5	-	-	3
Lurgan - 18 June -	-	1	1	-	-	-
Ballybot - 24 June -	1	-	1	-	-	-
Armagh - 13 Oct. -	1	3	1	-	-	-
Market-hill 22 Oct. -	-	3	2	-	-	-
Lurgan - 28 Dec. -	6	1	7	-	-	-
Ballybot - 4 Jan. 1837	-	1	12	-	-	-
	291	289	1,386	109	492	7

24 February 1837.

Leosard Dobbin, jun.,
 Clerk of the Peace.

CARLOW.

	£. 50	£. 20	£. 10	£. 10	£. 20
	Freeholders.	Leaseholders.	Freeholders.	Leaseholders.	Freeholders.
First sessions held pursuant to the 2d & 3d of Will. 4, commencing 10 Oct. 1832	215	13	108	49	752
Sessions, January 1833	2	1	1	0	6
Ditto April - - - -	1	-	3	1	3
Ditto June - - - -	3	1	2	1	18
Ditto October - - - -	4	-	1	3	4
Ditto January 1834	5	-	2	1	6
Ditto April - - - -	2	-	2	2	2
Ditto June - - - -	4	1	-	-	9
Ditto October - - - -	3	-	-	3	6
Ditto January 1835	2	-	6	-	41
Ditto April - - - -	20	1	5	5	13
Ditto June - - - -	6	-	-	-	2
Ditto October - - - -	14	-	5	29	19
Ditto January 1836	2	-	3	14	5
Ditto April - - - -	3	-	1	-	5
Ditto June - - - -	7	2	5	8	42
Ditto October - - - -	3	1	5	15	76
TOTAL - - - -	296	20	150	137	1,030

A. J. Humphrey,
 Clerk of the Peace.

CAVAN.

£ 50 Freeholders.	£ 30 Leaseholders.	£ 20 Freeholders.	£ 10 Leaseholders.	£ 10 Freeholders.	DATE OF REGISTRY.
157	16	241	76	1,648	1832: Special registry, October. - - Bailieborough sessions, 27 December.
1	-	1	5	14	
-	-	-	1	7	1833: Cavan sessions, 25 March.
-	-	-	1	1	Ballyconnell ditto, 30 March.
3	2	-	1	2	Cootehill ditto, 8 April.
1	1	-	-	3	Bailieborough ditto, 24 June.
2	-	-	1	8	Cavan ditto, 1 July.
-	1	-	1	7	Ballyconnell ditto, 14 Oct.
3	-	-	-	-	Cootehill ditto, 22 October.
-	-	-	-	4	Bailieborough ditto, 27 Dec.
3	-	-	1	-	1834: Cavan sessions, 3 July.
2	-	1	-	-	Ballyconnell ditto, 31 March.
1	-	-	-	-	Cootehill ditto, 7 April.
1	-	-	-	-	Bailieborough ditto, 27 June.
3	-	2	-	-	Cavan ditto, 30 June.
2	-	-	-	1	Ballyconnell ditto, 16 Oct.
1	-	-	-	-	Cootehill ditto, 22 October.
2	-	1	-	1	Bailieborough ditto, 27 Dec.
5	-	1	-	12	1835: Cavan sessions, 5 January.
5	-	2	-	4	Ballyconnell ditto, 27 March.
9	1	1	-	1	Cootehill ditto, 3 April.
6	-	1	-	7	Bailieborough ditto, 29 June.
6	1	1	-	8	Cavan ditto, 6 July.
1	-	-	-	13	Ballyconnell ditto, 13 Oct.
-	-	2	-	-	Cootehill ditto, 20 October.
-	-	-	-	3	Bailieborough ditto, 28 Dec.
3	2	1	1	4	1836: Cavan sessions, 4 January.
1	-	-	-	3	Cootehill ditto, 28 March.
-	-	-	-	5	Ballyconnell ditto, 5 April.
6	-	-	-	1	Bailieborough ditto, 21 June.
-	-	-	-	1	Cavan ditto, 27 June.
4	-	1	5	17	Cootehill ditto, 11 October.
7	-	2	2	26	Ballyconnell ditto, 18 Oct.
-	-	7	2	81	- Hilary ditto, Bailieborough, 27 December.
16	2	10	15	257	1837: Cavan sessions, 3 January.

Edward E. Mayne,

Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

14 March 1837.

Appendix (A.)

CLARE.

No. 1.
 Voters Registered
 in Counties.

		Date of Registry of each.					Total.
		1832.	1833.	1834.	1835.	1836.	
Number of voters registered in the county of Clare since the 1st of October 1836	3,141						
£. 50 freeholders	395	274	12	4	34	11	335
£. 20 leaseholders	25	14	5	1	3	2	25
£. 20 freeholders	285	246	6	8	4	3	267
£. 10 leaseholders	114	90	10	5	4	5	134
£. 10 freeholders	2,309	1,951	109	81	64	182	2,387
£. 50 rentcharges	4	2	-	-	1	1	4
£. 20 rentcharges	9	3	2	1	2	1	9
	3,141						3,141

William Keon,

Clerk of the Peace.

6 March 1837.

CORK.

Date of Session at which Registered.	Number of 50 l. Freeholders.	Number of 20 l. Leaseholders.	Number of 20 l. Freeholders.	Number of 10 l. Leaseholders.	Number of 10 l. Freeholders.
At the special sessions in October and November 1836	1,143	145	514	567	1,531
Bandon session - - - 1833	2	-	-	1	4
Macroom ditto - - - -	2	-	-	2	5
Bantry ditto - - - 1834	3	-	-	-	-
Bantry ditto - - - 1835	2	-	-	-	-
Skibbereen ditto - - - -	3	3	-	13	26
Clonskilly ditto - - - -	2	1	3	2	13
Bandon ditto - - - -	1	-	2	6	11
Macroom ditto - - - -	7	5	3	11	30
Bantry ditto - - - 1836	2	-	1	1	11
Skibbereen ditto - - - -	3	-	3	25	28
Clonskilly ditto - - - -	2	-	1	4	10
Bandon ditto - - - -	2	-	1	12	11
Macroom ditto - - - -	1	-	2	10	13
Bantry ditto - - - 1837	2	-	-	2	4
East Riding:					
Fermoy session - - - 1833	1	-	-	-	3
Kanturk ditto - - - -	-	-	-	-	7
Cork ditto - - - -	1	-	1	-	6
Midleton ditto - - - -	-	-	1	2	7
Mallow ditto - - - 1834	3	-	1	3	7
Cork ditto - - - -	-	-	-	-	3
Fermoy ditto - - - 1835	1	-	-	-	3
Mallow ditto - - - -	2	-	-	3	10
Kanturk ditto - - - -	6	-	-	7	17
Midleton ditto - - - -	-	3	2	15	20
Fermoy ditto - - - 1836	6	-	3	7	20
Mallow ditto - - - -	1	-	-	2	18
Kanturk ditto - - - -	3	-	-	1	5
Cork ditto - - - -	3	-	10	15	23
Midleton ditto - - - -	3	3	2	20	28
Fermoy ditto - - - 1837	1	-	1	10	14
Total - - - -	1,801	160	558	738	2,064

James Clatterton,

Clerk of the Peace.

Peace Office, 3 March 1837.

DONEGAL.

Number of 50 l. Freeholders.	Number of 20 l. Leaseholders.	Number of 10 l. Freeholders.	Number of 10 l. Leaseholders.	Number of 50 l. Freeholders.	DATE OF REGISTRY.
48	10	28	19	214	10 October - 1832
31	1	36	9	244	15 - - -
30	13	19	32	151	19 - - -
3	2	1	2	7	23 - - -
—	1	1	4	6	24 - - -
48	7	35	49	302	26 - - -
1	—	3	7	38	30 - - -
1	—	—	—	49	1 November - - -
—	—	2	—	6	27 December - - -
1	—	2	—	—	31 - - -
5	1	2	1	3	2 April - 1833
13	5	6	8	39	6 - - -
—	—	1	—	1	19 June - - -
2	3	3	—	5	24 - - -
1	—	2	—	2	16 October - - -
3	2	—	—	17	21 - - -
1	—	—	1	5	1 January - 1834
4	—	—	—	—	7 April - - -
1	—	1	—	—	19 June - - -
1	—	—	—	4	24 - - -
2	—	—	—	1	15 October - - -
3	—	1	—	14	20 - - -
1	—	1	—	—	29 December - - -
2	—	4	—	5	2 January - 1835
1	—	3	—	5	1 April - - -
9	2	5	1	16	6 - - -
1	—	1	7	8	25 June - - -
1	1	2	—	20	29 - - -
6	1	3	—	7	19 October - - -
1	—	4	11	1	28 December - - -
2	—	1	—	—	1 January - 1836
2	—	1	3	4	30 March - - -
6	1	1	1	8	4 April - - -
1	—	1	—	3	23 June - - -
1	1	—	—	1	27 - - -
1	—	4	—	9	19 October - - -
7	1	—	5	49	24 - - -
—	—	4	3	18	28 December - - -
7	1	2	7	55	2 January - 1837
248	53	180	161	1,317	

GENERAL SUMMARY of the above Return.

£. 50 freeholders	-	-	-	-	248
£. 20 leaseholders	-	-	-	-	53
£. 20 freeholders	-	-	-	-	180
£. 10 leaseholders	-	-	-	-	161
£. 10 freeholders	-	-	-	-	1,317

General Total of Voters in the county
of Donegal registered since the
1st October 1832- } 1,859

James Cutvan,
Clerk of the Peace.

Peace Office, Lifford,
3 March 1837.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

DOWN.

Number of 20L Freeholders.	Number of 20L Leaseholders.	Number of 10L Freeholders.	Number of 10L Leaseholders.	Number of 5L Freeholders.	DATE OF REGISTRY.
79	1	54	-	424	10 October - 1832.
23	-	10	-	192	15 - -
57	5	39	1	286	17 - -
35	-	32	2	228	20 - -
50	1	47	2	468	25 - -
26	-	25	3	229	31 - -
31	-	26	6	253	5 November -
29	2	77	20	306	9 - -
5	-	4	7	19	28 December -
5	1	3	2	5	3 January - 1833.
3	-	-	-	10	27 March -
1	-	1	-	2	3 April -
4	-	-	-	4	18 June -
6	-	1	2	21	24 - -
1	-	1	-	16	14 October -
1	-	-	-	2	21 - -
1	-	-	-	2	28 December -
2	1	-	-	6	31 March - 1834.
1	-	-	-	3	7 April -
1	-	-	-	5	17 June -
1	1	-	-	23	- -
1	-	3	-	10	13 October -
1	-	1	1	8	21 - -
1	-	-	-	2	2 December -
1	-	1	1	-	3 January - 1835
1	-	2	-	6	30 March -
1	-	2	-	3	6 April -
3	-	-	-	23	23 June -
5	1	-	-	1	29 - -
1	-	-	-	-	12 October -
1	-	-	-	1	20 - -
1	-	-	-	2	29 December -
3	-	-	-	-	4 January - 1836.
4	-	3	-	-	28 March -
2	-	3	-	1	4 April -
2	-	1	-	2	21 June -
2	-	1	-	-	27 - -
9	-	2	-	19	10 October -
11	-	7	3	28	18 - -
8	-	2	-	36	27 December -
10	-	7	-	23	2 January - 1837.

10 March 1837.

J. & R. Craig, Clerks of the Peace.

DUBLIN.

YEARS.	£.50 Freeholders.	£.20 Leaseholders.	£.10 Freeholders.	£.10 Leaseholders.	£.50 Freeholders.	TOTAL.
1832	682	281	325	301	473	2,062
1833	33	19	16	11	7	86
1834	14	6	6	2	6	35
1835	29	67	42	55	35	228
1836	73	58	30	58	50	269
1837	44	8	16	10	40	127
	945	439	435	437	600	2,876

B. Arthur, Clerk of the Peace.

FERMANAGH.

£. 50 FREEHOLDERS.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1892:			1892:
1	John Anderson	12 Oct.	65	Marshall B. Thomson	17 Oct.
2	John Anderson	ditto.	66	John McGuire	18 Oct.
3	Rev. Alex. Auchinleck	ditto.	67	John Brodshaw	ditto.
4	Rev. John Auchinleck	ditto.	68	Joseph Bennisson	ditto.
5	William Anderson	ditto.	69	Robert Bently	ditto.
6	Lord Viscount Cole	ditto.	70	Rev. Henry Roper	ditto.
7	John Brien	ditto.	71	Charles Crowe	ditto.
8	William Armstrong	ditto.	72	Charles Bleakly	ditto.
9	Lowther Brien	ditto.	73	Samuel Mayne	19 Oct.
10	Rev. William Athill	ditto.	74	Somerset Corry	ditto.
11	Rev. Butler Brooke	ditto.	75	William Corry	ditto.
12	Robert Johnston	ditto.	76	William Clusters	ditto.
13	Rev. James Owens	ditto.	77	John Collum	ditto.
14	Hugh Montgomery	ditto.	78	Thomas Charters	ditto.
15	William Anderson	ditto.	79	James Macartney	ditto.
16	Hugh Johnston	ditto.	80	James Boyd	ditto.
17	Rev. C. Cobb Beresford	ditto.	81	Thomas Armstrong	ditto.
18	Michael Jones	ditto.	82	John Elliott	20 Oct.
19	Hugh William Barton	ditto.	83	Michael Elliott	ditto.
20	Rev. J. Benson Tuthill	ditto.	84	James Elliott	ditto.
21	Rev. John James Fox	ditto.	85	Hamilton Irvine	ditto.
22	John Deering	ditto.	86	Henry Leslie	21 Oct.
23	John Betty	ditto.	87	Richard Daise	ditto.
24	Charles Archdall	13 Oct.	88	Edward Goodwin	ditto.
25	Rev. John Irvine	ditto.	89	David Gumley	ditto.
26	Henry Archdall	ditto.	90	William Thompson	ditto.
27	Edward Archdall	ditto.	91	Hon. Henry Corry	ditto.
28	John Armstrong	ditto.	92	J. Ainsworth Auchinleck	ditto.
29	Andrew Betty	ditto.	93	George Willis	ditto.
30	Alex. James Johnston	ditto.	94	James Haise	ditto.
31	Richard Ball	ditto.	95	George Willis	ditto.
32	Rev. Arthur H. Irvine	ditto.	96	Robert Hall	23 Oct.
33	Rev. John Grey Porter	ditto.	97	Robert Guahan	ditto.
34	Rev. James Moore	ditto.	98	William Hall	ditto.
35	Rev. William Porteus	15 Oct.	99	John Mayne	ditto.
36	Rowland Betty	ditto.	100	Henry Giesson	ditto.
37	Rev. George Miller	ditto.	101	Dacre Hamilton	ditto.
38	Robert Betty	ditto.	102	Charles C. Irvine	ditto.
39	Rev. Andrew Young	ditto.	103	Francis Mills	ditto.
40	Hamilton Scott	ditto.	104	J. Martin Moorehead	ditto.
41	William Scott	ditto.	105	William Bobbington	24 Oct.
42	John Crozier	ditto.	106	Alexander Nixon	ditto.
43	William Betty	ditto.	107	John Mouray Jones	ditto.
44	Thomas Armstrong	16 Oct.	108	William Loyd	ditto.
45	Simon Armstrong	ditto.	109	Rev. H. Lucas St. George	25 Oct.
46	Rev. John Sweeney	ditto.	110	William Mayne	ditto.
47	Charles Jones	ditto.	111	Rev. Robert Kinsel	ditto.
48	John Graydon Henderson	ditto.	112	Daniel F. Winslow	26 Oct.
49	Rowland Betty	ditto.	113	Ralph Soest	ditto.
50	James Denham	ditto.	114	Alexander Nixon, clerk	ditto.
51	Robert Clegg	ditto.	115	John Tracy	ditto.
52	John Copeland	ditto.	116	William Scott	ditto.
53	Rev. Lotius Geo. Read	ditto.	117	Charles Bleakly	27 Oct.
54	Hugh Collum	ditto.	118	Daniel Winslow	29 Oct.
55	John Chittick	ditto.	119	William Roddy	ditto.
56	George Housard	ditto.	120	William Bently	30 Oct.
57	William Armstrong	17 Oct.	121	Thomas M'Niece	ditto.
58	Hamilton Haise	ditto.	122	Henry Armstrong	5 Nov.
59	Montgomery Armstrong	ditto.	123	John Rankin	ditto.
60	Philip Dundas	ditto.	124	Thompson Livingston	ditto.
61	Rev. Thomas Berney	ditto.	125	Alexander Trotter	ditto.
62	Thomas Bailey	ditto.	126	Henry Cole	ditto.
63	Geo. Marshal Knipe	ditto.	127	Rev. Robert Noble	ditto.
64	Rev. John Richardson	ditto.	128	Robert Macartney	ditto.

Appendix (A.)

£. 50 Freeholders—continued.

No. 1
Voters Registered
in Councils.

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1830:			1834:
129	John Douglas Johnson	5 Nov.	189	Constantine Maguire	2 Jan.
130	Gorges Irvine	ditto.	190	Mervyn Archdall, jun.	6 Jan.
131	Jason Hassard	ditto.	191	Hen. Mervyn Richardson	7 Jan.
132	Alex. Fitzgerald Crawford	ditto.	192	William Betty	2 April
133	Edward Cooke	ditto.	193	Robert Haire	ditto.
134	Robert Joseph Fearn	5 Nov.	194	John McDonald	23 June
135	Henry Irvine	ditto.	195	Thomas Nixon	26 June
136	Jason Hassard	ditto.	196	George Leadrum	30 June
137	Petes Maguire	ditto.	197	William John Johnston	20 Oct.
138	William D'Arcy	ditto.	198	John Joyce	ditto.
139	John Hamilton Noble	7 Nov.	199	Philip Maguire	25 Oct.
140	William Hoey	ditto.	200	Rev. John Williamson	27 Oct.
141	Christopher Humphries	ditto.			1835:
142	John Humphries	ditto.	201	Andrew Teevan	2 Jan.
143	James Johnston	ditto.	202	William Hall	ditto.
144	Rev. Christopher Weir	ditto.	203	Sir Arthur Brooke	2 April
145	William Gamble	ditto.	204	Edward Denny	ditto.
146	William Falls	ditto.	205	Ambrose Upton Gledstanes	ditto.
147	Robert Johnston Weir	8 Nov.	206	John Bell	7 April
148	James Taylor Hurst	ditto.	207	Josiah William Hort	ditto.
149	Galbraith Moffatt	ditto.	208	Thomas Bunbury	29 June
150	William Irvine	ditto.	209	Rev. William Ball	ditto.
151	Gerard Somerville	ditto.	210	Samuel Gamble	ditto.
152	George Johnston	ditto.	211	Robert Johnston	ditto.
153	James Kidney	ditto.	212	John Parker	ditto.
154	Daniel Auchinleck	ditto.	213	George Whittaker	ditto.
155	Rev. Hugh Hamilton	9 Nov.	214	Clement Archer Kinsley	ditto.
156	William Robinson	ditto.	215	William Archdall	24 Oct.
157	John Richardson	ditto.	216	Rev. William James West	ditto.
158	Feliot Warren Barton	10 Nov.	217	Francis Macartney	ditto.
159	William Barton	ditto.	218	Jason Hassard	28 Dec.
160	John Wier	ditto.			1836:
161	Joseph Trimble	ditto.	219	Sir Galbraith Lowry Cole	1 Jan.
162	John Scott	ditto.	220	James Moore	ditto.
163	John Brown Macartney	ditto.	221	John Colpoys Bloomfield	ditto.
164	Gerrard Irvine	ditto.	222	Alexander Perceval	ditto.
165	William Faussett, clerk	ditto.	223	Alexander Hudson	ditto.
166	Daniel Auchinleck	ditto.	224	Thomas Wilkin	ditto.
167	William Hassard	12 Nov.	225	James Nestor	4 Jan.
168	Rev. John Chas. Maude	ditto.	226	John Creighton, esq.	29 March
169	William Irvine	ditto.	227	John M'Clintock, esq.	ditto.
170	John Whittaker	13 Nov.	228	Andrew Thompson	ditto.
171	George Nixon	14 Nov.	229	Thomas Armstrong	2 April
172	Alex. Nixon Montgomery	ditto.	230	James Quinton	ditto.
173	William Graham	15 Nov.	231	Edward Rogers	ditto.
		1838:	232	Rev. Mark Whittaker	ditto.
174	Gorges Marcus Irvine	1 Jan.	233	Rev. John Richardson	21 Jan.
175	William Falls	ditto.	234	Robert Mayne	ditto.
176	Samuel Betty	ditto.	235	William Warkles Deering	ditto.
177	William Betty	2 April	236	Rev. Mark Whittaker	24 Jan.
178	Colonel William Archdall	ditto.	237	John Charters	15 Oct.
179	John Pierce Hamilton	ditto.	238	Robert Johnston	20 Oct.
180	Henry Gresson	ditto.	239	Rev. Arthur Henry Irvine	ditto.
181	Arthur Noble	ditto.	240	Archibald Armstrong	27 Dec.
182	Alex. Hudson	5 April	241	John Martin Graydon, clerk	ditto.
183	Henry Vaughan Brooke	ditto.	242	Rev. James Walker King	ditto.
184	General Mervyn Archdall	ditto.	243	John Johnston	31 Dec.
185	Jason Hassard	ditto.			1836:
186	Christopher Carleton	ditto.	244	James Haire (omitted)	2 April
187	James Leadrum	10 April			
188	John Cooley	16 Oct.			

£. 20 LEASEHOLDERS.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

No.	Name of Voter.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Voter.	Date of Registry.
		1832:			1832:
1	Rev. George Irvine	12 Oct.	18	Edward Maguire	19 Nov.
2	Samuel Frith	16 Oct.	19	Baptist Young	13 Nov.
3	James Johnston	ditto.	20	William Irvine	ditto.
4	Andrew Crawford	ditto.	21	Robert Irvine	ditto.
5	Michael Crawford	ditto.			
6	Thomas Smith	17 Oct.			1833:
7	Christopher Coulson	20 Oct.	22	William Robinson	1 January.
8	James Fitzgerald	24 Oct.			1834:
9	Georad Dunbar	25 Oct.	23	John Henry Frith	25 June.
10	George Moore	ditto.	24	Richard Jackson	15 Oct.
11	William Noble	26 Oct.			1835:
12	Alexander Hudson	28 Oct.	25	Edward Irvine	29 June.
13	Andrew Armstrong	50 L. 8 Nov.			1836:
14	James Maguire	9 Nov.	26	Rev. Richard St. George	20 Oct.
15	Roger Maguire	ditto.	27	Howard St. George	ditto.
16	Alexander Maguire	ditto.	28	William Danc	31 Dec.
17	Francis Watkins	10 Nov.			

£. 20 FREEHOLDERS.

		1832:			1832:
1	Thomas Aiken	12 Oct.	44	William Hamilton	16 Oct.
2	John Aikin	ditto.	45	Patrick Campbell	ditto.
3	Simon Armstrong	ditto.	46	Thomas White	ditto.
4	Charles Fausset	ditto.	47	Andrew Comier	ditto.
5	William Armstrong	ditto.	48	Hugh Copeland	ditto.
6	Andrew Moffatt	ditto.	49	John Benney	17 Oct.
7	John Armstrong	ditto.	50	John Armstrong	ditto.
8	Rev. Andrew Staples Clark.	ditto.	51	Matthew Armstrong	ditto.
9	John Johnston	ditto.	52	William Armstrong	ditto.
10	Richard Brecken	ditto.	53	Charles R. Lucas	ditto.
11	John Caldwell	ditto.	54	William Auchinleck	ditto.
12	Archibald Johnston	ditto.	55	Nicholas Ellis	ditto.
13	James Johnston	ditto.	56	William Armstrong	ditto.
14	Rev. George Irvine	ditto.	57	Alexander Maguire	18 Oct.
15	David Cowan	ditto.	58	James Bell	ditto.
16	Robert Allingham	ditto.	59	Thomas Creighton	ditto.
17	William Dickson	ditto.	60	Rev. Thomas Brooke	ditto.
18	Thomas Armstrong	ditto.	61	Thomas Beatty	19 Oct.
19	John Armstrong	13 Oct.	62	John Chambers	ditto.
20	Rev. Wm. Armstrong	ditto.	63	John Charters	ditto.
21	Rev. George Harris	ditto.	64	Samuel Clarke	ditto.
22	John Beatty	ditto.	65	Robert Cleandianing	ditto.
23	James Beatty	ditto.	66	James Fitzgerald	ditto.
24	Guy Beatty	ditto.	67	James Allen	ditto.
25	William Beatty	ditto.	68	Richard Irvine	ditto.
26	Corry Wm. Beatty	ditto.	69	James Clutick	20 Oct.
27	Seewart Beatty	ditto.	70	James Clarke	ditto.
28	Joseph Ball	ditto.	71	Christopher Coulson	ditto.
29	Walter Bell	15 Oct.	72	William Brooks	ditto.
30	Guy Bleskly	ditto.	73	Robert Dixon	ditto.
31	John Keys	ditto.	74	Walter Graham	ditto.
32	William Crooke	ditto.	75	James Daughoe	22 Oct.
33	Rev. Robt. Staples Jacob	ditto.	76	William Lucy	ditto.
34	Henry Irvine	ditto.	77	Robert Laird	ditto.
35	Thomas Bleskly	ditto.	78	Owen Doonagan	ditto.
36	William Irvine	ditto.	79	Andrew Cassidy	ditto.
37	Guy Beatty	ditto.	80	William Forster	ditto.
38	John Beatty	ditto.	81	James Dunbar	ditto.
39	William Beatty, jun.	ditto.	82	Andrew McAlcon	ditto.
40	John Joyce	ditto.	83	Samuel Henderson	23 Oct.
41	Robert Shaw	16 Oct.	84	William Graham	ditto.
42	Irvine Armstrong	ditto.	85	Ebenezer Mitchell	ditto.
43	Adam Beatty	ditto.	86	William Hogg	ditto.
			87	John Hall	ditto.

Appendix (A.)

£. 20 Freeholders—continued.

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1832 :			1832 :
88	John West - - -	23 Oct.	154	Robert Livingston - - -	7 Nov.
89	John Gordon - - -	ditto.	155	John Kidney - - -	ditto.
90	Douglas Johnston - - -	ditto.	156	Francis Graham - - -	ditto.
91	William Langtree - - -	24 Oct.	157	Charles Graham - - -	ditto.
92	Patrick Tabman - - -	ditto.	158	James Kerr - - -	8 Nov.
93	George Loyd - - -	ditto.	159	Edward Thompson - - -	ditto.
94	William Loyd - - -	ditto.	160	John Trimble - - -	ditto.
95	Andrew Moffatt - - -	ditto.	161	William Elliott - - -	ditto.
96	Robert Little - - -	ditto.	162	George Hurst - - -	ditto.
97	James Armstrong - - -	25 Oct.	163	William Hurst - - -	ditto.
98	John Hall - - -	ditto.	164	George Hurst - - -	ditto.
99	James Allen - - -	ditto.	165	John Hurst - - -	ditto.
100	John Smyth - - -	ditto.	166	Alexander McClelland - - -	ditto.
101	Thomas Moore - - -	ditto.	167	John Maguire - - -	ditto.
102	John Story - - -	28 Oct.	168	Thomas Walsh - - -	ditto.
103	John Moore - - -	ditto.	169	Henry West - - -	ditto.
104	Hugh Ridell - - -	27 Oct.	170	Denis Quinton - - -	ditto.
105	William Willoughby - - -	ditto.	171	Hugh Loftus Gosden - - -	ditto.
106	Joseph Walsh - - -	ditto.	172	Richard Kirkpatrick - - -	ditto.
107	Charles Thompson - - -	ditto.	173	John Drummond - - -	ditto.
108	John Thompson - - -	ditto.	174	George Spear - - -	ditto.
109	Patt Doonagan - - -	30 Oct.	175	Rev. Francis Hurst - - -	ditto.
110	Arthur Scott - - -	ditto.	176	Thomas Keys - - -	ditto.
111	Joseph Whitely - - -	5 Nov.	177	Charles Moore - - -	9 Nov.
112	Thomas Wilson - - -	ditto.	178	Thomas Kennedy - - -	ditto.
113	David Robinson - - -	ditto.	179	John Keys - - -	ditto.
114	Edward Rexter - - -	ditto.	180	George Irvine - - -	ditto.
115	Thomas Robinson - - -	ditto.	181	Thomas Irvine - - -	ditto.
116	George Willis - - -	ditto.	182	David Johnston - - -	ditto.
117	Rev. John Frith - - -	ditto.	183	William Musgrove - - -	ditto.
118	Thomas Kernaghan - - -	ditto.	184	Charles Hamilton - - -	ditto.
119	Montgomery Downs Nixon - - -	ditto.	185	William Hunter - - -	ditto.
120	Christopher Johnston - - -	ditto.	186	George Wood - - -	ditto.
121	Thomas Keys - - -	ditto.	187	William Marshall - - -	ditto.
122	James Henderson - - -	ditto.	188	William Muldoon - - -	ditto.
123	John Halliday - - -	ditto.	189	Hugh Magrath - - -	ditto.
124	Patrick Hinds - - -	ditto.	190	Richard Owens - - -	ditto.
125	William Hinds - - -	ditto.	191	John Porteus - - -	ditto.
126	John Graham - - -	ditto.	192	Archibald McKenny - - -	ditto.
127	George Frazier - - -	ditto.	193	Robert Sommerville - - -	ditto.
128	William Frith - - -	ditto.	194	Joseph Rutledge - - -	ditto.
129	Thomas Dane - - -	ditto.	195	Edward Morrison - - -	ditto.
130	William Armstrong - - -	ditto.	196	Owen Murphy - - -	ditto.
131	William Armstrong - - -	ditto.	197	James Vietch - - -	10 Nov.
132	William Ellis - - -	6 Nov.	198	Christopher Graham - - -	ditto.
133	Edward Fallis - - -	ditto.	199	John Trimble - - -	ditto.
134	Thomas Fallis - - -	ditto.	200	James O'Brien - - -	ditto.
135	Thomas Dundass - - -	ditto.	201	John Nixon - - -	ditto.
136	Gilly Devitr - - -	ditto.	202	John M'Mulcan - - -	ditto.
137	Edward Campbell - - -	ditto.	203	Thomas Little - - -	ditto.
138	Henry Wm. Hetherington - - -	ditto.	204	William Johnston - - -	ditto.
139	Isaac Thompson - - -	ditto.	205	William Graham - - -	ditto.
140	William Thompson - - -	ditto.	206	John Wilkin - - -	ditto.
141	Rev. Joseph Story - - -	ditto.	207	James Burnside - - -	ditto.
142	William Graham - - -	ditto.	208	Robert Robinson - - -	12 Nov.
143	John Gamble - - -	ditto.	209	Alexander Shaw - - -	ditto.
144	William Noble - - -	7 Nov.	210	John Johnston - - -	ditto.
145	John Henderson - - -	ditto.	211	William Trotter - - -	ditto.
146	William Elliott - - -	ditto.	212	George Moore - - -	13 Nov.
147	Benjamin Noble - - -	ditto.	213	Oswald Sturdy - - -	ditto.
148	John Forster - - -	ditto.	214	Patrick Rodgers - - -	ditto.
149	Gerrard M'Gregor - - -	ditto.	215	William Crommer - - -	ditto.
150	James Keys - - -	ditto.	216	George Chitick - - -	ditto.
151	Baptist Gamble - - -	ditto.	217	James Copeland - - -	14 Nov.
152	Moses M'Brien - - -	ditto.	218	John Watson - - -	ditto.
153	Terence Mihan - - -	ditto.	219	Francis Watson - - -	ditto.

£ 20 Freeholders—continued.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1832:			
200	James Trevan - - -	20 Nov.	239	Alexander Acheson - - -	1834:
201	John Kelso - - -	21 Nov.	240	Robert Lindsay - - -	24 Oct.
202	Mark Noble - - -	ditto.			25 Oct.
203	James Armstrong - - -	27 Dec.			1835:
204	James Bemy - - -	ditto.	241	John Parker - - -	2 Jan.
205	George Fowler - - -	29 Dec.	242	Benjamin Noble - - -	7 April.
		1833:	243	James Jeffers - - -	29 June.
226	James Monaghan - - -	1 Jan.	244	William Crooke - - -	ditto.
227	Francis Murphy - - -	ditto.	245	Frederick T. Nixon - - -	24 Oct.
228	William Beatty - - -	3 Jan.	246	Robert Keys - - -	ditto.
229	Patrick Cassidy - - -	2 April.	247	John Wilkie - - -	ditto.
230	James Woods - - -	6 April.	248	David Wilkie - - -	ditto.
231	Christopher Betty - - -	ditto.	249	Randal Stafford - - -	28 Dec.
232	Edward Armstrong - - -	16 Oct.			1836:
		1834:	250	Thomas Berresford - - -	1 Jan.
233	William Keoghnan - - -	2 Jan.	251	John Brown - - -	ditto.
234	Patrick Hinds - - -	ditto.	252	William Scott - - -	ditto.
235	David Armstrong - - -	19 June.	253	Samuel Betty - - -	ditto.
236	Alexander Irvine - - -	23 June.	254	John Dunlop - - -	29 March.
237	William Smith - - -	15 Oct.	255	Alexander McDowal - - -	ditto.
238	William Little - - -	20 Oct.	256	Thomas Gustridge - - -	1 April.
			257	Arthur Forster - - -	ditto.
			258	John Gordon - - -	20 Oct.

£ 10 LEASEHOLDERS.

		1832:			1833:
1	John Betty, jun. - - -	13 Oct.	25	Clare Hemphrys - - -	1 Jan.
2	Henry Betty - - -	ditto.	26	John Johnston - - -	3 Jan.
3	John Betty, sen. - - -	ditto.			1834:
4	Francis Ball - - -	15 Oct.	27	George Allingham - - -	23 June.
5	Allen Cathcart - - -	ditto.	28	Bryan McCawley - - -	ditto.
6	James Browne - - -	19 Oct.	29	Daniel Vmce - - -	ditto.
7	William Noble - - -	26 Oct.	30	Benjamin Whitsett - - -	15 Oct.
8	John Collins - - -	29 Oct.	31	William Graham - - -	25 Oct.
9	Thomas Cathcart - - -	5 Nov.	32	Guy Hillard - - -	ditto.
10	John Henry Frith - - -	8 Nov.	33	John Hillard - - -	ditto.
11	James Steel - - -	10 Nov.	34	John Hillard, jun. - - -	ditto.
12	Alexander Steel - - -	ditto.			1835:
13	James Nelson - - -	12 Nov.	35	William Betty - - -	7 April.
14	Christopher Muldoon - - -	ditto.			1836:
15	John Muldoon - - -	ditto.	36	James Carson - - -	1 Jan.
16	John Hamilton - - -	ditto.	37	Rev. John Delap - - -	2 April.
17	Archibald Hamilton - - -	ditto.	38	Robert Graham - - -	ditto.
18	Acheson Black - - -	13 Nov.	39	Andrew Bracken - - -	ditto.
19	James Black - - -	ditto.	40	William Bracken - - -	ditto.
20	Robert Black - - -	ditto.	41	Thomas Hemphrys - - -	ditto.
21	John Black - - -	ditto.	42	John Macart - - -	ditto.
22	George Black - - -	ditto.	43	James Coulson - - -	ditto.
23	John Little - - -	ditto.	44	Hugh Bracken (omitted)	1 Jan.
24	Terence Maguire - - -	27 Dec.			

£ 10 FREEHOLDERS.

		1832:			1832:
1	Thomas Aiken - - -	12 Oct.	6	William Blair - - -	12 Oct.
2	John Aiken - - -	ditto.	7	Andrew Chambers - - -	ditto.
3	Guy Acheson - - -	ditto.	8	Robert Armstrong - - -	ditto.
4	Robert Armstrong - - -	ditto.	9	William Anderson - - -	ditto.
5	William Chambers - - -	ditto.	10	Andrew Armstrong - - -	ditto.

Appendix (A.)

£. 10 Freeholders—continued.

No. 1
Voters Registered
in Counties.

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1832 :			1832 :
11	Terence Donnelly - -	12 Oct.	77	James Berney - -	15 Oct.
12	Charles Armstrong - -	ditto.	78	George Browne - -	ditto.
13	George Irvine Armstrong	ditto.	79	Robert Burgess - -	ditto.
14	William Armstrong - -	13 Oct.	80	Crozier Betty - -	ditto.
15	John Armstrong - -	ditto.	81	James Bogs - -	ditto.
16	Joseph Anderson, jun. - -	ditto.	82	George Bleakly - -	16 Oct.
17	Simon Armstrong - -	ditto.	83	John Black - -	ditto.
18	Joseph Anderson - -	ditto.	84	William Crowe - -	ditto.
19	Joseph Anderson - -	ditto.	85	Robert Campbell - -	ditto.
20	John Armstrong - -	ditto.	86	William Allen - -	ditto.
21	James Arthur - -	ditto.	87	George Sproul - -	ditto.
22	Hugh Donnelly - -	ditto.	88	John Crawford - -	ditto.
23	William Armstrong - -	ditto.	89	James Crawford - -	ditto.
24	Alexander Acheson - -	ditto.	90	Thomas Brady - -	ditto.
25	Ralph Acheson - -	ditto.	91	Joseph Arbutkel - -	ditto.
26	Joseph Anderson - -	ditto.	92	James Blenkly - -	ditto.
27	Joseph Armstrong - -	ditto.	93	Robert Campbell - -	ditto.
28	Alexander Armstrong - -	ditto.	94	John Carson - -	ditto.
29	John Acheson - -	ditto.	95	Edward Brien - -	ditto.
30	Hugh Acheson - -	ditto.	96	John Browne - -	ditto.
31	William Anderson - -	ditto.	97	William Brien - -	ditto.
32	Corry William Beatty - -	ditto.	98	David Beatty - -	ditto.
33	Thomas Bell - -	ditto.	99	William Bushfield - -	ditto.
34	William Blair - -	ditto.	100	Robert Brownlie - -	ditto.
35	Anthony Barton - -	ditto.	101	William Johnston - -	ditto.
36	William Beatty - -	ditto.	102	Galbraith Hamilton - -	ditto.
37	James Betty - -	ditto.	103	James Cashrite - -	ditto.
38	William Breen - -	ditto.	104	John Cunningham - -	ditto.
39	John Boks - -	ditto.	105	Peter Cassidy - -	ditto.
40	John Ball - -	ditto.	106	Francis Cassidy - -	ditto.
41	Hugh Broken - -	ditto.	107	Henry Fassett - -	ditto.
42	William Besdy - -	ditto.	108	Andrew Clendinning - -	ditto.
43	John Brown - -	ditto.	109	Henry Crawford - -	ditto.
44	Daniel Brady - -	ditto.	110	Patrick Carroll - -	ditto.
45	William Anderson - -	ditto.	111	George Coulter - -	ditto.
46	John Armstrong - -	ditto.	112	James Carson - -	ditto.
47	William Burgess - -	ditto.	113	Charles Clendinnin - -	ditto.
48	William Beatty - -	ditto.	114	John Beuken - -	ditto.
49	Edward Beggs - -	15 Oct.	115	Edward Cassidy - -	ditto.
50	William Browne - -	ditto.	116	John M'Brien - -	ditto.
51	James Browne - -	ditto.	117	Henry Coghlan - -	ditto.
52	Henry Brien - -	ditto.	118	William Corrigan - -	ditto.
53	Robert Brien - -	ditto.	119	John Carson - -	ditto.
54	William Britton - -	ditto.	120	James Clendinnin - -	ditto.
55	Robert Browne - -	ditto.	121	Edward Carson - -	ditto.
56	James Benson - -	ditto.	122	John Pierce Hamilton - -	17 Oct.
57	William Brownlie - -	ditto.	123	William Armstrong - -	ditto.
58	William Brownlie, jun. - -	ditto.	124	William Armstrong - -	ditto.
59	Charles Brady - -	ditto.	125	John Armstrong - -	ditto.
60	Christopher Betty - -	ditto.	126	Francis Armstrong - -	ditto.
61	John Gorrell - -	ditto.	127	William Armstrong - -	ditto.
62	John Bracken - -	ditto.	128	John Armstrong - -	ditto.
63	William Brien - -	ditto.	129	James Askin - -	ditto.
64	Edward Boyd - -	ditto.	130	Edward Armstrong - -	ditto.
65	William Bailly - -	ditto.	131	Alexander Anchenieck - -	ditto.
66	Christopher Buchanan - -	ditto.	132	Archibald Anderson - -	ditto.
67	William Bell - -	ditto.	133	Archibald Anderson - -	ditto.
68	John Bell - -	ditto.	134	William Tubman - -	ditto.
69	John Brooster - -	ditto.	135	William Arnell - -	ditto.
70	James Bell - -	ditto.	136	Edward Anderson - -	ditto.
71	James Busted - -	ditto.	137	George Armstrong - -	ditto.
72	John Willis Betty - -	ditto.	138	John Adams - -	ditto.
73	William Breen - -	ditto.	139	Robert Armstrong - -	ditto.
74	Joseph Blakely - -	ditto.	140	Robert Bogue - -	18 Oct.
75	Charles Bleakly, sen. - -	ditto.	141	James Brien - -	ditto.
76	Charley Bleakly, jun. - -	ditto.	142	George Crawford - -	ditto.

£. 10 Freeholders—continued.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1892:			1892:
143	George Armstrong -	18 Oct.	209	Moses Elliott -	20 Oct.
144	William Allen -	ditto.	210	John Irvine -	ditto.
145	Christopher Burnside -	ditto.	211	John Forster -	ditto.
146	James Beatty -	ditto.	212	James Elliott -	ditto.
147	Robert Bleakly -	ditto.	213	John Emo -	ditto.
148	Elliott Allen -	ditto.	214	Alexander Clarke -	ditto.
149	William Bleakly -	ditto.	215	James Connolly -	ditto.
150	John Beatty -	ditto.	216	John Danlop -	ditto.
151	James Burnside -	ditto.	217	Bernard Donnelly -	ditto.
152	Thomas Burnside -	ditto.	218	George Doogan -	ditto.
153	Thomas Baker -	ditto.	219	James Dunlop -	ditto.
154	George Beatty -	ditto.	220	Joseph Dunlop -	ditto.
155	William Brown -	ditto.	221	Robert Dixon -	ditto.
156	Alexander Browne -	ditto.	222	Hugh Dragon -	ditto.
157	John Beatty -	ditto.	223	John Dixon -	ditto.
158	James Beatty -	ditto.	224	James Fallis -	ditto.
159	Robert Beatty -	ditto.	225	Alexander Levingston -	ditto.
160	John Burnside -	ditto.	226	James Donnelly -	ditto.
161	James Beatty -	ditto.	227	Alexander Allen -	ditto.
162	Joseph Browne -	ditto.	228	Alexander Allen -	ditto.
163	Hugh Bogue -	ditto.	229	James Dawson -	ditto.
164	Terence Bogue -	ditto.	230	Alexander Danlop -	ditto.
165	John Beatty -	ditto.	231	Edward Dunlap -	ditto.
166	James Beatty -	ditto.	232	William Delap -	ditto.
167	Richard Beatty -	ditto.	233	James Farrell -	ditto.
168	George Beatty -	ditto.	234	Patrick McNamara -	ditto.
169	Bernard Bogue -	ditto.	235	George Arnold -	ditto.
170	William Brison -	ditto.	236	James Eskin -	ditto.
171	George Baxter -	ditto.	237	Robert Edgerton -	ditto.
172	Edward Baxter -	ditto.	238	John Elliott -	ditto.
173	Richard Beatty -	ditto.	239	Francis O'Lea -	ditto.
174	Robert Cowan -	ditto.	240	Thomas Forster -	ditto.
175	Thomas Burnside -	ditto.	241	William Irvine -	ditto.
176	Edward Beatty -	ditto.	242	Johnston Ehrim -	ditto.
177	William Bleakly -	ditto.	243	William Humphrys -	ditto.
178	John Bleakly -	ditto.	244	Mathew Finlay -	ditto.
179	John Linnay -	ditto.	245	John Welsh -	ditto.
180	George Beatty -	ditto.	246	James Welsh -	ditto.
181	Philip Bogue -	ditto.	247	Thomas Moffatt -	ditto.
182	William Brison -	19 Oct.	248	Francis Forster -	22 Oct.
183	William Beatty -	ditto.	249	Adam Flanagan -	ditto.
184	Thomas Beatty -	ditto.	250	William Anderson -	ditto.
185	Edward Briens -	ditto.	251	James Fee -	ditto.
186	Edward Busnell -	ditto.	252	William Flanagan -	ditto.
187	Cumilis Busnell -	ditto.	253	Bernard Gavan -	ditto.
188	Christopher Bleakly -	ditto.	254	Hugh Nevin -	ditto.
189	Henry Bogue -	ditto.	255	Michael M'Donagh -	ditto.
190	Edward Crooke -	ditto.	256	John Gunnis -	ditto.
191	Joseph Crooke -	ditto.	257	Lawrence Philips -	ditto.
192	William Crooke -	ditto.	258	Samuel Little -	ditto.
193	James Crooke -	ditto.	259	William Graham -	ditto.
194	Francis Coulter -	ditto.	260	Robert Welsh -	ditto.
195	Denis Callaghan -	ditto.	261	John Foster -	ditto.
196	William Carrothers -	ditto.	262	Thomas Donaghoe -	ditto.
197	Robert Cooke -	ditto.	263	William Forster -	ditto.
198	Rev. Edward M'Cue -	ditto.	264	Robert Forster -	ditto.
199	James Clingan -	ditto.	265	William Finlay -	ditto.
200	Samuel M'Minn -	ditto.	266	William Crawford -	ditto.
201	Thomas Scarfeit -	ditto.	267	Thomas Moffatt -	ditto.
202	Andrew Dixon -	ditto.	268	Gilbert Elliott -	ditto.
203	George Carrothers -	ditto.	269	John Gilligan -	ditto.
204	George Carrothers -	ditto.	270	Alexander Graham -	ditto.
205	Owen Callaghan -	ditto.	271	William Steery -	ditto.
206	Thomas Clingan -	ditto.	272	John Robinson -	ditto.
207	David Carrother -	ditto.	273	William Little -	ditto.
208	Robert Clingan -	ditto.	274	Mathew Gilroy -	ditto.

Appendix (A.)

£. 10 Freeholders—continued.

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1892:			1892:
275	Charles Hall - - -	23 Oct.	341	Edward Logan - - -	24 Oct.
276	Thomas Hall - - -	ditto.	342	John Long - - -	ditto.
277	James Harper - - -	ditto.	343	Robert Moffitt - - -	ditto.
278	John Brenden - - -	ditto.	344	Michael Marten - - -	ditto.
279	James Hogg - - -	ditto.	345	William Kettle - - -	ditto.
280	Arthur Hanna - - -	ditto.	346	Oliver Kidd - - -	ditto.
281	John Harper - - -	ditto.	347	John Linn - - -	ditto.
282	William Hamilton - - -	ditto.	348	Henry Jones - - -	ditto.
283	James Hall - - -	ditto.	349	William Little - - -	ditto.
284	Thomas Hall - - -	ditto.	350	William Linn - - -	ditto.
285	John Hanna - - -	ditto.	351	John Maguire - - -	ditto.
286	Patrick McCaffry - - -	ditto.	352	Terence Maguire - - -	ditto.
287	Christopher Graham - - -	ditto.	353	Edward Malligan - - -	ditto.
288	John Ebbett - - -	ditto.	354	James Mulligan - - -	ditto.
289	Joseph Ebbett - - -	ditto.	355	Adm Little - - -	ditto.
290	Thomas Hogg - - -	ditto.	356	John Keenan - - -	ditto.
291	George Hoey - - -	ditto.	357	James Little - - -	ditto.
292	William Harper - - -	ditto.	358	John McCorry - - -	ditto.
293	Andrew Hoey - - -	ditto.	359	Hugh McCann - - -	ditto.
294	Daniel Richard Hearn - - -	ditto.	360	Alexander Montgomery - - -	ditto.
295	John Harper - - -	ditto.	361	Hugh Montgomery - - -	ditto.
296	Matthew Johnston - - -	ditto.	362	Thomas M'Manus - - -	ditto.
297	Jeremiah Irvine - - -	ditto.	363	Anthony Kidd - - -	ditto.
298	Andrew Irvine - - -	ditto.	364	Richard Ryan - - -	25 Oct.
299	William Nesbitt Irvine - - -	ditto.	365	William Ryan - - -	ditto.
300	Gerrard Frederick Irvine - - -	ditto.	366	Henry Robinson - - -	ditto.
301	James Jones - - -	ditto.	367	John Keys - - -	ditto.
302	James Johnston - - -	ditto.	368	Richard Kenwell - - -	ditto.
303	Robert Irvine - - -	ditto.	369	Robert Little - - -	ditto.
304	James Johnston - - -	ditto.	370	Edward M'Mahon - - -	ditto.
305	James Johnston - - -	ditto.	371	John Morrison - - -	ditto.
306	Joseph Henderson - - -	ditto.	372	Rev. Alexander Hurst - - -	ditto.
307	Thomas Jordan - - -	ditto.	373	Anthony Mitchell - - -	ditto.
308	Michael Johnston - - -	ditto.	374	Francis Macartney - - -	ditto.
309	James Johnston - - -	ditto.	375	Bernard M'Elroy - - -	ditto.
310	John Woods - - -	ditto.	376	Patrick M'Conker - - -	ditto.
311	William Watkins - - -	ditto.	377	James M'Elroy - - -	ditto.
312	Walter Ren - - -	ditto.	378	James M'Elroy - - -	ditto.
313	Samuel Morton - - -	ditto.	379	George M'Knight - - -	ditto.
314	William Kenwell - - -	ditto.	380	James Morrison - - -	ditto.
315	Andrew Johnston - - -	ditto.	381	James Mitchell - - -	ditto.
316	Thomas Johnston - - -	ditto.	382	John Woods - - -	ditto.
317	Christopher Johnston - - -	ditto.	383	Abraham Kennedy - - -	ditto.
318	William Summers - - -	ditto.	384	Henry Lowry - - -	ditto.
319	John Johnston - - -	ditto.	385	Andrew Breslin - - -	ditto.
320	Thomas Tolman - - -	24 Oct.	386	Robert Morrison - - -	ditto.
321	James Hall - - -	ditto.	387	William Fanssett - - -	ditto.
322	Hugh Keenan - - -	ditto.	388	James Maguire - - -	ditto.
323	Charles Cassidy - - -	ditto.	389	James Owens - - -	ditto.
324	Arthur Smith - - -	ditto.	390	Andrew Maguire - - -	ditto.
325	Samuel Lindsay - - -	ditto.	391	Robert Mitchell - - -	ditto.
326	Thomas M'Cartney - - -	ditto.	392	John Moote - - -	ditto.
327	John Rutledge - - -	ditto.	393	John Morrison - - -	ditto.
328	George Patterson - - -	ditto.	394	Teague Murphy - - -	ditto.
329	Thomas Murry - - -	ditto.	395	William Murphy - - -	ditto.
330	Thomas Martin - - -	ditto.	396	Philip McCaffry - - -	ditto.
331	Alexander Kettle - - -	ditto.	397	Andrew Murphy - - -	ditto.
332	John Kettle - - -	ditto.	398	John Thomas Galbraith - - -	ditto.
333	Francis Kettle - - -	ditto.	399	John Little - - -	ditto.
334	James Kettle - - -	ditto.	400	James Forster - - -	ditto.
335	Noble Liddle - - -	ditto.	401	Robert Little - - -	ditto.
336	Bernard Maguire - - -	ditto.	402	John Montgomery - - -	ditto.
337	Robert Liddle - - -	ditto.	403	Thomas M'Coey - - -	ditto.
338	Thomas Johnston - - -	ditto.	404	Henry M'Elroy - - -	ditto.
339	James Johnston - - -	ditto.	405	John M'Mahon - - -	ditto.
340	William Kennedy - - -	ditto.	406	James Montgomery - - -	ditto.

£. 10 Freeholders—continued.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1832 :			1832 :
407	Thomas Mitchell	25 Oct.	473	John Thompson	27 Oct.
408	Robert Mitchell	ditto.	474	William Thompson	ditto.
409	James Moore	ditto.	475	Thomas Thompson, jun.	ditto.
410	Henry Lun	ditto.	476	Robert Thompson	ditto.
411	William Linn	ditto.	477	Richard Thompson	ditto.
412	Archibald Little	ditto.	478	Thomas Thompson	ditto.
413	John Liddle	ditto.	479	Thomas Thompson	ditto.
414	Gilbert Liddle	ditto.	480	James Thompson	ditto.
415	Thomas Liddle	ditto.	481	John Trimble	ditto.
416	Teague Murphy	ditto.	482	John Trimble, jun.	ditto.
417	James Maguire	ditto.	483	William Trimble	ditto.
418	James McCaffry	ditto.	484	James Warrell	ditto.
419	Hugh Martin	26 Oct.	485	Andrew Campbell	ditto.
420	William Robinson	ditto.	486	Felix McCaffry	ditto.
421	James Lang	ditto.	487	William White	ditto.
422	Patt McCorry	ditto.	488	Gabriel Wilson	ditto.
423	Hugh Riddle	ditto.	489	William Warrell	ditto.
424	John Riedge	ditto.	490	Hugh M'Alcon	29 Oct.
425	Thomas Wiggins	ditto.	491	Charles M'Alcon	ditto.
426	Francis Reid	ditto.	492	Patt Martin	ditto.
427	James Paul	ditto.	493	James Haire	ditto.
428	Thomas Palmer	ditto.	494	Henry Montgomery	ditto.
429	Patrick Maguire	ditto.	495	George Winslow	ditto.
430	Alexander Morton	ditto.	496	Guy Taylor	ditto.
431	Alexander M'Donald	ditto.	497	Francis Sory	ditto.
432	James M'Manus	ditto.	498	Archibald Hewit	ditto.
433	James McElroy	ditto.	499	Thomas Morien	ditto.
434	James Murphy	ditto.	500	Elmsy Winslow	ditto.
435	William Patterson	ditto.	501	David Patten	30 Oct.
436	Patrick Keenan	ditto.	502	Moses Hall	ditto.
437	Joseph Orr	ditto.	503	James Tubman	ditto.
438	William Liddle	ditto.	504	Nathaniel Drem	ditto.
439	Edward Dunbar	ditto.	505	James Duncannon	ditto.
440	William Bell	ditto.	506	George King	ditto.
441	John Armstrong	ditto.	507	Samuel Holmesworth	ditto.
442	George Scholes	ditto.	508	Terence Dunagan	ditto.
443	Alexander Ren	ditto.	509	John Thompson	31 Oct.
444	George Ren	ditto.	510	George Winstaker	5 Nov.
445	Thompson Rea	ditto.	511	John Ramsey	ditto.
446	William Reed	ditto.	512	William Graham	ditto.
447	George Reed	ditto.	513	Christopher Robinson	ditto.
448	William Lattimore	ditto.	514	William Maguire	ditto.
449	George Hanna	ditto.	515	Peter Murphy	ditto.
450	Henry Pierce	ditto.	516	John Moffa	ditto.
451	James Neely	ditto.	517	Thomas Maguire	ditto.
452	William Summers	ditto.	518	Noble Graham	ditto.
453	John M'Donald	ditto.	519	James Johnston	ditto.
454	Edward Noble	ditto.	520	Thomas Johnston	ditto.
455	Robert Johnston	ditto.	521	Charles Johnston	ditto.
456	William Tubman	27 Oct.	522	William Johnston, sen.	ditto.
457	Thomas Tubman	ditto.	523	William Johnston	ditto.
458	Edward Wilson	ditto.	524	John Johnston, sen.	ditto.
459	Thomas Wilson	ditto.	525	James Johnston	ditto.
460	George Willis	ditto.	526	Charles Hetherington	ditto.
461	George Willis	ditto.	527	John Hall	ditto.
462	John Taylor	ditto.	528	George Henderson	ditto.
463	John Pannell	ditto.	529	John Graham	ditto.
464	Robert Tubman	ditto.	530	William Graham	ditto.
465	Redmond O'Brien	ditto.	531	John Gibson	ditto.
466	Robert Thompson	ditto.	532	John Fossett	ditto.
467	Samuel Montgomery	ditto.	533	Thomas Frazier	ditto.
468	William Liddle	ditto.	534	William Eason	ditto.
469	John Somerville	ditto.	535	John Elliott	ditto.
470	Robert Whistly	ditto.	536	Thomas Doyle	ditto.
471	James Taylor	ditto.	537	George Crooks	ditto.
472	John Thompson	ditto.	538	David Campbell	ditto.

Appendix (A.)

£. 10 Freeholders—continued.

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1832 :			1832 :
539	Arthur Corrigan - - -	5 Nov.	605	Andrew Keys - - -	6 Nov.
540	John Crozier - - -	ditto.	606	Henry Keys - - -	ditto.
541	George Crooke - - -	ditto.	607	Thomas Keys - - -	ditto.
542	Robert Cowan - - -	ditto.	608	John Keys - - -	ditto.
543	Robert Cowan - - -	ditto.	609	Charles Keys - - -	ditto.
544	John Carson - - -	ditto.	610	Thomas Keys - - -	ditto.
545	William Coulter - - -	ditto.	611	Thomas Graham - - -	ditto.
546	George Brian - - -	ditto.	612	Edward Kennedy - - -	ditto.
547	William Acheson - - -	ditto.	613	George Kitson - - -	ditto.
548	Christopher Armstrong - - -	ditto.	614	Hugh Keys - - -	ditto.
549	James Armstrong - - -	ditto.	615	James Kirkpatrick - - -	ditto.
550	Joseph Beatty - - -	ditto.	616	William Kirkpatrick - - -	ditto.
551	James Beatty - - -	ditto.	617	James Kitson - - -	ditto.
552	Robert Armstrong - - -	6 Nov.	618	Richard Aikens - - -	ditto.
553	Samuel Batten - - -	ditto.	619	William Gaddis - - -	ditto.
554	James Elliott - - -	ditto.	620	James Little - - -	ditto.
555	Thomas Ellis - - -	ditto.	621	James Moffat - - -	ditto.
556	Mark Emerson - - -	ditto.	622	Redmond M'Consker - - -	7 Nov.
557	William Emerson - - -	ditto.	623	William Henderson - - -	ditto.
558	James Ellis - - -	ditto.	624	William Elliott - - -	ditto.
559	James Elliott - - -	ditto.	625	Hugh Elliott - - -	ditto.
560	George Elliott - - -	ditto.	626	John Elliott - - -	ditto.
561	Robert Elliott - - -	ditto.	627	Andrew Elliott - - -	ditto.
562	John Fletcher, jun. - - -	ditto.	628	Henry Campbell - - -	ditto.
563	John Fields - - -	ditto.	629	Thomas Hegaden - - -	ditto.
564	William Forster - - -	ditto.	630	Robert Hillard - - -	ditto.
565	John Fletcher, jun. - - -	ditto.	631	James Hodgins - - -	ditto.
566	James Frish - - -	ditto.	632	Thomas Elliott - - -	ditto.
567	Philip Dornien - - -	ditto.	633	Thomas Armstrong - - -	ditto.
568	William Dase - - -	ditto.	634	Christopher Armstrong - - -	ditto.
569	William Dundass - - -	ditto.	635	John Noble - - -	ditto.
570	Owen Donnelly - - -	ditto.	636	Henry M'Dermot - - -	ditto.
571	Francis Dogerty - - -	ditto.	637	William Porter - - -	ditto.
572	Owen Durasen - - -	ditto.	638	John Robinson - - -	ditto.
573	Francis Daly - - -	ditto.	639	George Trotter - - -	ditto.
574	Samuel Deblin - - -	ditto.	640	William Humphrys - - -	ditto.
575	Edward Corry - - -	ditto.	641	James Humphrys - - -	ditto.
576	Francis Cashbill - - -	ditto.	642	William Humphrys - - -	ditto.
577	John Crozier - - -	ditto.	643	Patt Humphrys - - -	ditto.
578	Christopher Crozier - - -	ditto.	644	John Maynes - - -	ditto.
579	Alexander Passaet - - -	ditto.	645	Francis Magirr - - -	ditto.
580	James Flemming - - -	ditto.	646	Michael Magirr - - -	ditto.
581	Thomas Johnston - - -	ditto.	647	Johnston Humphrys - - -	ditto.
582	James Johnston - - -	ditto.	648	Hugh Flanagan - - -	ditto.
583	John Hoey - - -	ditto.	649	James Irvine - - -	ditto.
584	William Hunt - - -	ditto.	650	Harriet Irvine - - -	ditto.
585	Thomas Humphrys - - -	ditto.	651	Francis Jobsson - - -	ditto.
586	Robert Shaw - - -	ditto.	652	John Johnston - - -	ditto.
587	Robert Ramsay - - -	ditto.	653	Robert Willis - - -	ditto.
588	David Brouster - - -	ditto.	654	Hugh Johnston - - -	ditto.
589	Robert Henderson - - -	ditto.	655	Thomas Johnston - - -	ditto.
590	Hugh Mechie - - -	ditto.	656	Hugh Johnston - - -	ditto.
591	Thomas Gordon - - -	ditto.	657	Henry Gaddis - - -	ditto.
592	Matthew Gorrell - - -	ditto.	658	John Gaddis - - -	ditto.
593	Robert Gorrell - - -	ditto.	659	Joseph Godber - - -	ditto.
594	Thomas Graham - - -	ditto.	660	George Godber - - -	ditto.
595	Henry Gaddis - - -	ditto.	661	John Johnston - - -	ditto.
596	John Gaddis - - -	ditto.	662	David Flanagan - - -	ditto.
597	James Graham - - -	ditto.	663	Thomas Hodgins - - -	ditto.
598	John Graham - - -	ditto.	664	James Wilson - - -	ditto.
599	Robert Gunnis - - -	ditto.	665	George Keys - - -	ditto.
600	William Graham - - -	ditto.	666	Adam Keys - - -	ditto.
601	John Glass - - -	ditto.	667	Samuel Keys - - -	ditto.
602	James Gunnis - - -	ditto.	668	Charles Keys - - -	ditto.
603	James Fair - - -	ditto.	669	Thomas Keys - - -	ditto.
604	Andrew Falls - - -	ditto.	670	Cornelius Keon - - -	ditto.

£. 10 Freeholders—continued.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1892:			1892:
671	Edward Lipsett	7 Nov.	737	James McCaffry	8 Nov.
672	William Glanis	ditto.	738	Humphrys M'Asarin	ditto.
673	Robert Ginn	ditto.	739	James Nixon	ditto.
674	George M'Naught	ditto.	740	Redmond M'Cusker	ditto.
675	Robert Hughes	ditto.	741	Daniel Sheehan	ditto.
676	George Johnston	ditto.	742	James Smith	ditto.
677	Robert Johnston	ditto.	743	Thomas Robinson	ditto.
678	Francis Johnston	ditto.	744	James Wilson	ditto.
679	James Johnston	ditto.	745	James Wintry	ditto.
680	Walter Johnston	ditto.	746	William Wilson	ditto.
681	Terence Keon	ditto.	747	John Quaid	ditto.
682	Francis Keon	ditto.	748	James Gormley	ditto.
683	Daniel Keon	ditto.	749	Robert Huston	ditto.
684	Francis Keon	ditto.	750	Gerrard Howden	ditto.
685	Hugh Breen	ditto.	751	Henry Leonard	ditto.
686	Andrew Flanagan	ditto.	752	John M'Kenny	ditto.
687	James Ferguson	ditto.	753	Cornick Maguire	ditto.
688	Thomas Graham	ditto.	754	Edward Owens	ditto.
689	William Henderson	ditto.	755	Edward Nixon	ditto.
690	Francis Clarke	ditto.	756	James Nixon	ditto.
691	John Thompson	ditto.	757	John Wilson	ditto.
692	Bernard Kelly	ditto.	758	James Coulter	ditto.
693	William Leadly	ditto.	759	Thomas Irvine	ditto.
694	William Gorrell	ditto.	760	Christopher Kennedy	ditto.
695	William Gildea	ditto.	761	Thomas M'Gulrick	ditto.
696	Robert Graham	ditto.	762	Hugh M'Donald	ditto.
697	John Little	ditto.	763	James M'Naught	ditto.
698	John Johnston	ditto.	764	Phibbe M'Gregor	ditto.
699	Gerrard Irvine	ditto.	765	John Potters	ditto.
700	William Irvine	ditto.	766	Charles Woods	ditto.
701	John Keys	ditto.	767	Francis Potters	ditto.
702	Owen Flanagan	ditto.	768	George Noble	ditto.
703	Aschbald Ewart	8 Nov.	769	John Bell	9 Nov.
704	James Faussett	ditto.	770	James Law	ditto.
705	William Faussett	ditto.	771	William Moffatt	ditto.
706	James Faussett	ditto.	772	Andrew Moffatt	ditto.
707	Bernard Gil Murray	ditto.	773	James Moffatt	ditto.
708	Thomas Outridge	ditto.	774	John Keys	ditto.
709	Arthur Johnston	ditto.	775	James Irvine	ditto.
710	James Johnston	ditto.	776	William Johnston	ditto.
711	Andrew Lucy	ditto.	777	Francis Johnston	ditto.
712	Anthony Lucy	ditto.	778	Arthur Johnston	ditto.
713	Robert Lanny	ditto.	779	Patterson Jolly	ditto.
714	William Lanny	ditto.	780	John Irvine	ditto.
715	William Lanny	ditto.	781	John Johnston	ditto.
716	John Moffatt	ditto.	782	Edward Brian	ditto.
717	Patt Lanny	ditto.	783	William Dudgeon	ditto.
718	Richard Magre	ditto.	784	William Freeborn	ditto.
719	James Moore	ditto.	785	William M'Clelland	ditto.
720	Peter Moffatt	ditto.	786	William M'Clelland	ditto.
721	Crawwell Pierce	ditto.	787	Robert Johnston	ditto.
722	John Porteus	ditto.	788	Charles Bleakly	ditto.
723	Andrew Wilson	ditto.	789	Matthew Dinnia	ditto.
724	Peter Thompson	ditto.	790	Peter Gardner	ditto.
725	Hugh Willis	ditto.	791	James Hamilton	ditto.
726	Gay Wilson	ditto.	792	Hugh Kison	ditto.
727	James Graham	ditto.	793	Charles Lane	ditto.
728	Michael Hurst	ditto.	794	John Lane	ditto.
729	Anthony Hurst	ditto.	795	William Howden	ditto.
730	Joseph Henderson	ditto.	796	Andrew Ferguson	ditto.
731	William Hurst	ditto.	797	Thomas Ewart	ditto.
732	Robert Henderson	ditto.	798	Joseph Gillespy	ditto.
733	Francis M'Brien	ditto.	799	Edward Montgomery	ditto.
734	Terence Martin	ditto.	800	John Magrath	ditto.
735	Daniel Maguire	ditto.	801	Hugh Thompson	ditto.
736	James Macartney	ditto.	802	William Wamsley	ditto.

£. 10 Freeholders—continued.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1891:			1892:
803	Hugh Wilson -	9 Nov.	870	Hugh Swanston -	10 Nov.
804	Robert Rutledge -	ditto.	871	Alexander Robinson -	ditto.
805	Robert Porteus -	ditto.	872	James Robinson -	ditto.
806	George Rankin -	ditto.	873	Robert Porteus -	ditto.
807	William Nixon -	ditto.	874	Thomas Porteus -	ditto.
808	Edward Nixon -	ditto.	875	John Nixon -	ditto.
809	Hugh Nixon -	ditto.	876	John Nixon -	ditto.
810	Francis Parsons -	ditto.	877	Philip M'Curker -	ditto.
811	William Parker -	ditto.	878	Edward M'Curker -	ditto.
812	Thomas Parker -	ditto.	879	John Maguire -	ditto.
813	James Montgomery -	ditto.	880	Hugh Montgomery -	ditto.
814	Charles Maguire -	ditto.	881	Bernard Maguire -	ditto.
815	Roger Maguire -	ditto.	882	Terence M'Manus -	ditto.
816	Robert Stephenson -	ditto.	883	John Keon -	ditto.
817	Andrew Thompson -	ditto.	884	James Johnston -	ditto.
818	Thomas Marshall -	ditto.	885	James Irvine -	ditto.
819	Charles Walker -	ditto.	886	Robert Huston -	ditto.
820	James Woods -	ditto.	887	John Graham -	ditto.
821	George Marshall -	ditto.	888	John Conlter -	ditto.
822	John Marshall -	ditto.	889	William Brown -	ditto.
823	William Marshall -	ditto.	890	James Wilson -	ditto.
824	Noble M'Gregor -	ditto.	891	John Wilson -	10 Nov.
825	Edward Rodgers -	ditto.	892	Robert Wilson -	ditto.
826	John Noble -	ditto.	893	Francis Johnston -	ditto.
827	James Stephenson -	ditto.	894	Guy Armstrong -	ditto.
828	Henry Ramsay -	ditto.	895	Robert Burnside -	ditto.
829	John Marshall -	ditto.	896	William Burnside -	ditto.
830	John M'Donald -	ditto.	897	Thomas Thompson -	ditto.
831	James Moore -	ditto.	898	Archibald Johnston -	ditto.
832	James Thompson -	ditto.	899	George Campbell -	ditto.
833	Ankey Wilson -	ditto.	900	John Scott -	ditto.
834	William Whitaker -	ditto.	901	Charles Wilson -	ditto.
835	John Rogers -	ditto.	902	John Shaw -	ditto.
836	George Rutherford -	ditto.	903	Andrew M'Manus -	ditto.
837	Allen Rutherford -	ditto.	904	Robert Summersville -	ditto.
838	Thomas Scott -	ditto.	905	Robert Simson -	ditto.
839	James Rutherford -	ditto.	906	Alexander Simson -	ditto.
840	Gabriel Rutherford -	ditto.	907	Henry M'Kenney -	ditto.
841	David Rutherford -	ditto.	908	Thomas Ellis -	ditto.
842	George Pierce -	ditto.	909	Thomas Reid -	ditto.
843	Zachariah Patterson -	ditto.	910	Gabriel Watson -	ditto.
844	John Patterson -	ditto.	911	Robert Hazzard -	ditto.
845	Phil. Murphy -	ditto.	912	Thomas Wallis -	ditto.
846	William Thompson -	ditto.	913	Francis M'Cawley -	ditto.
847	James Thompson -	ditto.	914	Edward Johnston -	ditto.
848	Edward Thompson -	ditto.	915	James M'Clenn -	ditto.
849	John Thompson -	ditto.	916	Thomas Strong -	ditto.
850	Thomas Woods -	ditto.	917	Denis Gilgoun -	ditto.
851	William Wilson -	ditto.	918	John Goody -	ditto.
852	James M'Quaid -	ditto.	919	Alexander Aikens -	ditto.
853	John Robinson -	ditto.	920	Henry Bleakly -	ditto.
854	Thomas Moffit -	ditto.	921	Felix Gallagher -	ditto.
855	George Morrison -	ditto.	922	Gerrard Irvine -	ditto.
856	William Morrison -	ditto.	923	Edward Simson -	ditto.
857	William Johnston -	10 Nov.	924	John Graham -	ditto.
858	William Swanston -	ditto.	925	Andrew Knox -	ditto.
859	Robert Farlow -	ditto.	926	William Maguire -	ditto.
860	John Chittick -	ditto.	927	Hugh Malherin -	ditto.
861	John Crammer -	ditto.	928	James Magrath -	ditto.
862	John Willes -	ditto.	929	Michael Sheenan -	ditto.
863	Jason Wilson -	ditto.	930	Alexander Little -	ditto.
864	William Wilson -	ditto.	931	Charles Phillips -	ditto.
865	Thomas Wanchop -	ditto.	932	Patrick Maguire -	ditto.
866	Alexander Wilson -	ditto.	933	John Wilson, jun. -	ditto.
867	Edward Willis -	ditto.	934	Philip Wrenock -	ditto.
868	William Trotter -	ditto.			
869	Edward Swanston -	ditto.			

£. 10 Freeholders—continued.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voices Registered
in Counties.

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1833:			
945	Philip Scott - - -	12 Nov.	999	James Kitson - - -	1833:
946	John Strong - - -	ditto.	1000	William Browne - - -	1 Jan.
947	William Phillehane - - -	ditto.	1001	James Keen - - -	ditto.
948	Thomas Price - - -	ditto.	1002	Robert M'Minn - - -	3 Jan.
949	William Owens - - -	ditto.	1003	Andrew Hoey - - -	2 April.
949	Hugh Owens - - -	ditto.	1004	Hugh Maguire - - -	ditto.
951	Thomas M'Manus - - -	ditto.	1005	William Keras - - -	ditto.
952	Patrick Muldoon - - -	ditto.	1006	James Steen - - -	4 April.
943	Walter Scott - - -	ditto.	1007	Francis Dundas - - -	6 April.
944	James Wilson - - -	ditto.	1008	Thomas Elliott - - -	ditto.
945	William Dundas - - -	ditto.	1009	John Price - - -	ditto.
946	James Craig - - -	ditto.	1010	Samuel Marten - - -	16 Oct.
947	James Bastard - - -	ditto.	1011	Charles Cosler - - -	ditto.
948	Michael M'Dermott - - -	13 Nov.	1012	Patrick Cliferty - - -	ditto.
949	James Price - - -	ditto.	1013	Samuel Sumnerall - - -	ditto.
950	James Rutledge - - -	ditto.	1014	Hugh Read - - -	ditto.
951	Daniel Stevin - - -	ditto.	1015	Michael Nowlan - - -	ditto.
952	Pheix Carroll - - -	ditto.	1016	John Laird - - -	ditto.
953	James Ferguson - - -	ditto.	1017	James Bredin - - -	ditto.
954	John Trotter - - -	ditto.	1018	William Carrothers - - -	ditto.
955	David Swindall - - -	ditto.	1019	James Galbraith - - -	ditto.
956	John Carroll - - -	ditto.	1020	Andrew Bredin - - -	ditto.
957	George Ailingham - - -	ditto.	1021	James Presley - - -	19 Oct.
958	Joseph Alexander - - -	ditto.			1834:
959	John Buchanan - - -	ditto.	1022	George Irvine - - -	19 June.
960	John Johnston - - -	ditto.	1023	Samuel Lowry - - -	ditto.
961	John Little - - -	ditto.	1024	John Hurst - - -	ditto.
962	Thomas Johnston - - -	ditto.	1025	James Summerville - - -	ditto.
963	George Rutledge - - -	ditto.	1026	Samuel M'Keon - - -	ditto.
964	David Johnston - - -	ditto.	1027	Henry M'Elroy - - -	ditto.
965	Patrick Kenny - - -	ditto.	1028	George Beatty - - -	ditto.
966	Owen Leonard - - -	ditto.	1029	Conner Dregan - - -	ditto.
967	Edward Graham - - -	ditto.	1030	William Armstrong - - -	ditto.
968	Hugh Bechen - - -	14 Nov.	1031	Maxwell Brison - - -	ditto.
969	John Graham - - -	15 Nov.	1032	Andrew Eritt - - -	ditto.
970	Bryan M'Connick - - -	16 Nov.	1033	Samuel Armstrong - - -	ditto.
971	Thomas M'Byss - - -	17 Nov.	1034	John Burnsde - - -	ditto.
972	Thomas Corrigan - - -	ditto.	1035	Thomas Hurst - - -	ditto.
973	Phil. M'Mason - - -	ditto.	1036	James Robinson - - -	ditto.
974	John Hamilton - - -	ditto.	1037	James M'Crea - - -	23 June.
975	Hugh Lunny - - -	22 Nov.	1038	Christopher Armstrong - - -	ditto.
976	William Noble - - -	27 Dec.	1039	Robert Barton - - -	ditto.
977	Robert Scott - - -	ditto.	1040	William Crawford - - -	ditto.
978	Robert Dixon - - -	ditto.	1041	Edward Carson - - -	ditto.
979	George Betty - - -	ditto.	1042	James Price - - -	ditto.
980	James Primrose - - -	ditto.	1043	William Howe - - -	ditto.
981	Edward Boyd - - -	ditto.	1044	Hugh Kerr - - -	ditto.
982	Edward Boyd - - -	ditto.	1045	Robert Lunny - - -	ditto.
983	William Scholes, jnn. - - -	29 Dec.	1046	William Robinson - - -	ditto.
		1833:	1047	George Robinson - - -	26 June.
984	Henry Monaghan - - -	1 Jan.	1048	Christopher Brennan - - -	15 Oct.
985	Francis Gallagher - - -	ditto.	1049	James Betty, jnn. - - -	ditto.
986	James Keys - - -	ditto.	1050	Robert Eacine - - -	ditto.
987	Thomas M'Donald - - -	ditto.	1051	James Hogg - - -	ditto.
988	James Monaghan - - -	ditto.	1052	Alexander Noble - - -	ditto.
989	Bernard Monaghan - - -	ditto.	1053	James Bamford - - -	ditto.
990	John Monaghan - - -	ditto.	1054	William Armstrong - - -	ditto.
991	Thomas M'Caffry - - -	ditto.	1055	Robert Allen - - -	ditto.
992	Edmond Monaghan - - -	ditto.	1056	John Jordan - - -	18 Oct.
993	Henry Keys - - -	ditto.	1057	Robert Little - - -	ditto.
994	John Wilson - - -	ditto.	1058	Thomas Johnston - - -	ditto.
995	David Marshall - - -	ditto.	1059	Christopher Coulson - - -	ditto.
996	James Summerville - - -	ditto.	1060	John Hemphill - - -	20 Oct.
997	Thomas Moffit - - -	ditto.	1061	William Craig - - -	ditto.
998	Terence Maguire - - -	ditto.	1062	Edward Fadda - - -	ditto.

Appendix (A.)

£. 10 Freeholders—continued.

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1834:			
1083	John Acheson - - -	25 Oct.	1127	Patrick M'Manus - - -	1835: 20 Oct.
1084	Andrew Armstrong - -	ditto.	1128	Nathaniel Neely - - -	ditto.
1085	Christopher Buchanan -	ditto.	1129	Joseph Orr - - -	ditto.
1086	Thomas Carson - - -	ditto.	1130	Joseph Vetch - - -	ditto.
1087	William Campbell - - -	ditto.	1131	Robert Walker - - -	ditto.
1088	Thomas Campbell - - -	ditto.	1132	James Elliott - - -	24 Oct.
1089	George Elliott - - -	ditto.	1133	Gustavus Dundass - - -	ditto.
107	William Eaton - - -	ditto.	1134	Moses Dundass - - -	ditto.
1071	John Fausset - - -	ditto.	1135	Thomas Johnston - - -	ditto.
1072	John Gutery - - -	ditto.	1136	George M'Kee - - -	ditto.
1073	John Graham - - -	ditto.	1137	Robert Johnston - - -	ditto.
1074	Thomas Henderson - - -	ditto.	1138	James Johnston - - -	ditto.
1075	John Hall - - -	ditto.	1139	Robert Johnston - - -	ditto.
1076	Isaac Henderson - - -	ditto.	1140	Simon Johnston - - -	ditto.
1077	John Henderson - - -	ditto.	1141	Thomas Johnston - - -	ditto.
1078	George Hurst - - -	ditto.	1142	Felix Corran - - -	ditto.
1079	Thomas Irvine - - -	ditto.	1143	William Graham - - -	ditto.
108	Andrew M'A. Teggart -	ditto.	1144	James Rogers - - -	ditto.
1081	William Noble - - -	ditto.	1145	James M'Brian - - -	ditto.
1082	James Thompson - - -	ditto.	1146	Thomas Hall - - -	ditto.
1083	Thomas Scott - - -	ditto.	1147	James Teevan - - -	ditto.
1084	James Rankin - - -	ditto.	1148	James Patterson - - -	ditto.
1085	John Rutherford - - -	ditto.	1149	James Balfour - - -	ditto.
1086	Philip Murphy - - -	29 Dec.	1150	Bernard Campbell - - -	ditto.
		1835:			
		1 Jan.	1151	John Campbell - - -	ditto.
1087	John Coulson - - -	1 Jan.	1152	Patrick Dundass, sen.	ditto.
1088	Henry Aiken - - -	2 Jan.	1153	James Elliott - - -	ditto.
1089	Thomas Aiken - - -	ditto.	1154	Edward Johnston - - -	ditto.
109	Robert Acheson - - -	ditto.	1155	Noble M'Brian - - -	ditto.
1091	Andrew Cleddinning -	ditto.	1156	James M'Callagh - - -	ditto.
1092	James Dundass - - -	ditto.	1157	John Timmony - - -	ditto.
1093	Thomas Gutery - - -	ditto.	1158	Andrew Teevan - - -	ditto.
1094	Matthew Henderson - -	ditto.	1159	Henry Dundass - - -	ditto.
1095	John Stephenson - - -	ditto.	1160	James Warnock - - -	ditto.
1096	William Swanston - - -	ditto.	1161	John M'Brian - - -	ditto.
1097	Robert Swanson - - -	ditto.	1162	Gabriel Spence - - -	ditto.
1098	Thompson Armstrong -	3 Jan.	1163	Francis Johnston - - -	ditto.
1099	Jeremiah Elliott - - -	6 Jan.	1164	John Robinson - - -	ditto.
1100	Alexander Acheson - -	2 April.	1165	Robert Robinson - - -	ditto.
1101	Edward Brians - - -	ditto.	1166	William Hall - - -	ditto.
1102	Edward Bussel - - -	ditto.	1167	Robert Wilson - - -	ditto.
1103	Edward Brians - - -	ditto.	1168	Richard Dickson - - -	ditto.
1104	Denis Collins - - -	ditto.	1169	David Bell - - -	ditto.
1105	Thomas Collins - - -	ditto.	1170	Richard Dickson - - -	ditto.
1106	Flemming Clingon - -	ditto.	1171	Simon Armstrong - - -	ditto.
1107	William Harper - - -	ditto.	1172	James Fowler - - -	ditto.
1108	John Maguire - - -	ditto.	1173	William Burnside - - -	28 Dec.
1109	William M'Elroy - - -	ditto.	1174	John Armstrong - - -	ditto.
1110	Pool Rusk - - -	ditto.	1175	Andrew Kidd - - -	ditto.
1111	Richard Rusk - - -	ditto.			1836:
1112	Francis Wilson - - -	ditto.	1176	John Carson - - -	1 Jan.
1113	Henry Cutheart - - -	7 April.	1177	Robert Johnston - - -	ditto.
1114	George Elliott - - -	ditto.	1178	Hugh Bracken - - -	ditto.
1115	John Irvine - - -	ditto.	1179	William Huston - - -	ditto.
1116	Zachariah Patterson -	ditto.	1180	James Johnston - - -	ditto.
1117	John Warnock - - -	ditto.	1181	Adam Carrigan - - -	ditto.
1118	James Sandeis - - -	25 June.	1182	Christopher Johnston -	ditto.
1119	Henry Breden - - -	ditto.	1183	Alexander Johnston -	ditto.
1120	John Perry - - -	ditto.	1184	Francis Johnston - - -	ditto.
1121	Christopher Delap - - -	ditto.	1185	William White - - -	ditto.
1122	Robert Dowly Hearn -	ditto.	1186	William Campbell - - -	ditto.
1123	Joseph Hillock - - -	ditto.	1187	John Teoburns - - -	ditto.
1124	James Bredin - - -	20 Oct.	1188	James Graham - - -	ditto.
1125	James Farmer - - -	ditto.	1189	John M'Crea - - -	ditto.
1126	Christopher Johnston -	ditto.	1190	Daniel M'Gulrick - - -	ditto.

£. 10 Freeholders—continued.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.	No.	Name of Freeholder.	Date of Registry.
		1836:			1836:
1191	John Eaton - - -	1 January.	1228	John Hall, jun. - - -	2 April.
1192	William Owens - - -	ditto.	1229	Alexander Ferguson - - -	ditto.
1193	John Acheson - - -	ditto.	1230	John Ferguson - - -	ditto.
1194	Robert Acheson - - -	ditto.	1231	Edward Kerr - - -	ditto.
1195	John Robinson - - -	ditto.			
1196	Alexander Trotter, jun. - - -	ditto.	1232	Peter Jones - - -	ditto.
1197	Rev. James Smyth - - -	ditto.	1233	James Cathcart - - -	ditto.
1198	Thomas Hall - - -	ditto.	1234	William Johnston - - -	ditto.
1199	Charles Darnin - - -	ditto.	1235	Joseph Armstrong - - -	ditto.
1200	Redmond M'Casker - - -	7 January	1236	James M'Brien - - -	ditto.
			1237	John Wadsworth - - -	ditto.
1201	Francis Adams - - -	29 March.	1238	William Drennan - - -	ditto.
1202	William Henry Glendinning.	ditto.	1239	William Wier - - -	ditto.
1203	Samuel Mayne, jun. - - -	ditto.	1240	Andrew Stafford - - -	ditto.
1204	John S. Mayne - - -	ditto.	1241	John Armstrong - - -	ditto.
1205	James Beatty - - -	ditto.	1242	Terence Leonard - - -	ditto.
1206	William Acheson - - -	2 April.	1243	Edward Owens - - -	ditto.
1207	Thomas Moffatt - - -	ditto.	1244	Richard Elliott - - -	ditto.
1208	Edward Porteus - - -	ditto.	1245	James Cosalter - - -	ditto.
1209	John Corrin - - -	ditto.	1246	William Rogers - - -	ditto.
1210	Robert Hyndman - - -	ditto.	1247	George Elliott - - -	ditto.
1211	James Balfour - - -	ditto.	1248	John Bracken - - -	ditto.
1212	Andrew Nixon - - -	ditto.	1249	John Price - - -	ditto.
1213	Edward Kerr - - -	ditto.	1250	John Brown - - -	ditto.
1214	Matthew Feares - - -	ditto.	1251	Francis Magill - - -	ditto.
1215	Simon Johnston, jun. - - -	ditto.	1252	Samuel Rutherford - - -	ditto.
1216	Francis Earls - - -	ditto.	1253	George Howe - - -	ditto.
1217	William Scott - - -	ditto.	1254	James Wilson - - -	ditto.
1218	James M'Cullagh, jun. - - -	ditto.	1255	Thomas Elliott - - -	24 June.
1219	John Hall, sen. - - -	ditto.	1256	Robert Brossier - - -	ditto.
1220	James Hall - - -	ditto.	1257	Peter Moffatt - - -	ditto.
1221	Thomas Elliott - - -	ditto.	1258	Thomas Allen - - -	15 Oct.
1222	William Elliott - - -	ditto.	1259	Joseph Coulson - - -	ditto.
1223	James Corrigan - - -	ditto.	1260	William M'Brien - - -	20 Oct.
1224	William Ferguson - - -	ditto.	1261	William Carson - - -	31 Dec.
1225	Edward Ferguson - - -	ditto.	1262	John Moffit - - -	ditto.
1226	William Robinson - - -	ditto.	1263	Thomas Hunter - - -	ditto.
1227	John Dundass - - -	ditto.	1264	John Swift - - -	ditto.

There were not any appeals in this county.

£.50 Freeholders	- - - - -	264
£.20 Leasholders	- - - - -	28
£.20 Freeholders	- - - - -	258
£.10 Leasholders	- - - - -	44
£.10 Freeholders	- - - - -	1,264
TOTAL	- - - - -	1,858

Adam Nixon, Clerk of the Peace.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

G A L W A Y.

£ 50 Freeholders.	£ 50 Leaseholders.	£ 20 Freeholders.	£ 10 Leaseholders.	£ 10 Freeholders.	Place, and Date of Registry.
334	4	170	117	4,637	- - All registered in October and November 1830, at several sessions held under Reform Act.
					1833:
1	-	-	-	4	Loughrea, 3 January.
-	-	-	1	9	Tuam, January.
2	-	-	-	9	Eyrecoort, 28 March.
1	-	-	-	9	Galway, 4 April.
1	-	-	-	12	Loughrea, 18 June.
-	-	1	-	4	Tuam, 26 June.
-	-	2	-	5	Gort, 14 October.
1	-	-	2	3	Galway, 22 October.
4	-	3	-	36	Loughrea, 27 December.
					1834:
-	-	-	-	33	Tuam, 4 January.
-	-	4	-	76	Eyrecoort, 31 March.
-	-	1	-	34	Galway, 8 April.
-	-	11	-	9	Loughrea, 18 June.
1	-	11	-	75	Tuam, 26 June.
1	-	-	-	1	Gort, 14 October.
-	-	1	-	20	Galway, 22 October.
2	-	3	-	13	Loughrea, 27 December.
					1835:
1	-	1	5	9	Tuam, 5 January.
7	-	-	-	7	Eyrecoort, 30 March.
2	-	3	-	4	Galway, 7 April.
2	-	1	-	20	Loughrea, 22 June.
-	-	2	-	20	Tuam, 30 June.
7	-	2	-	21	Gort, 14 October.
1	-	1	-	4	Galway, 22 October.
1	-	1	-	9	Loughrea, 28 December.
					1836:
-	-	-	-	5	Tuam, 5 January.
-	-	-	1	36	Eyrecoort, 30 March.
5	-	1	-	-	Galway, 4 April.
6	-	4	-	11	Loughrea, 20 June.
1	-	-	-	2	Tuam, 28 June.
-	-	-	-	-	Gort, 17 October.
1	-	1	-	2	Galway, 22 October.
4	-	4	-	35	Loughrea, 28 December.
					1837:
2	-	2	-	3	Tuam, 5 January.

James Kelly, Clerk of the Peace.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

KILKENNY.

Year.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 20 Leaseholders.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 20 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	Date of Registry.
						1832:
118	99	-	17	4	68	10 October.
166	50	3	19	7	85	13 —
108	30	-	6	6	65	17 —
587	69	3	34	71	410	20 —
205	41	-	19	11	124	3 November.
67	6	-	4	12	45	10 —
3	3	-	-	-	-	27 December.
						1833:
1	1	-	-	-	-	3 January.
1	1	-	-	-	-	2 April.
1	1	-	-	-	-	9 —
2	1	-	-	-	1	24 June.
2	1	-	1	-	-	16 October.
2	2	-	-	-	-	23 —
2	1	-	1	-	-	30 December.
						1834:
2	2	-	-	-	-	6 January.
1	1	-	-	-	-	1 April.
1	1	-	-	-	-	7 —
2	-	-	-	-	2	27 October.
5	5	-	-	-	-	31 December.
						1835:
4	4	-	-	-	-	7 January.
56	16	1	5	5	28	31 March.
82	9	1	4	11	57	8 April.
11	6	-	1	1	3	29 June.
22	3	-	1	10	8	8 July.
5	3	-	2	-	-	15 October.
12	1	-	1	4	6	29 —
						1836:
8	2	-	2	1	3	5 January.
3	3	-	-	-	-	15 —
2	2	-	-	-	-	29 March.
7	6	-	1	-	-	7 April.
2	2	-	-	-	-	6 July.
73	7	-	6	17	43	15 October.
185	6	3	7	23	116	25 —
26	9	2	7	4	4	28 December.
						1837:
49	2	2	2	18	25	6 January.
1,791	306	15	140	205	1,105	

John Pross, Clerk of the Peace.

KING'S COUNTY.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Votes Registered
in Counties.

DATE OF REGISTRY.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 30 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	£. 10 Leaseholders.	£. 10. Freeholders.
10 October 1832	5	-	9	7	-
11	5	-	-	3	14
12	4	-	3	2	15
13	1	-	-	1	1
15	8	-	2	-	11
16	9	-	6	-	23
17	8	-	4	-	11
18	18	-	6	-	19
19	26	-	3	-	8
20	11	-	5	-	12
22	9	-	2	-	23
23	4	-	1	-	10
24	11	-	6	2	27
25	22	-	10	2	21
26	25	-	12	-	23
27	12	1	8	1	23
29	12	-	8	1	17
30	33	-	7	1	26
31	18	-	3	-	16
1 November	8	1	2	-	27
2	7	-	5	-	23
3	2	-	2	-	28
5	5	-	5	-	23
6	12	1	12	-	31
7	15	-	8	-	20
8	14	1	9	1	44
9	2	1	5	-	18
10	5	-	5	1	26
12	6	1	9	1	8
13	3	-	5	-	39
14	7	-	1	-	39
15	1	-	2	-	14
16	5	-	5	-	36
17	6	1	19	1	54
3 January 1833	2	-	3	2	26
8	3	-	8	3	73
29 March	-	2	1	1	16
4 April	3	-	1	-	-
21 June	1	-	2	-	-
27	2	-	1	-	19
16 October	1	-	-	-	2
22	2	1	1	1	3
2 January 1834	2	-	2	-	2
16 March	-	-	-	-	1
1 April	2	-	-	-	-
17 June	1	-	-	-	-
23	-	-	-	-	4
22 October	3	-	-	-	4
28	-	-	-	-	9
27 December	4	1	4	-	-
2 January 1835	2	1	-	-	11
27 March	2	-	2	2	28
2 April	7	-	2	-	4
2 April	9	-	1	-	4
23 June	3	-	1	-	10
29	6	-	5	-	-
21 October	2	-	-	-	8
27	5	-	5	1	3
29 December	-	-	-	-	3
4 January 1836	4	-	-	-	21
28 March	11	-	5	2	38
2 April	4	-	-	-	-
23 June	2	2	4	4	-
29	2	-	-	-	11
19 October	4	-	1	1	26
25	5	1	-	5	34
2 January 1837	4	1	5	1	15
7	7	-	-	4	-

Robert Harding, Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

LIMERICK.

Appendix (A.)
No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

Number Registered.	FREEHOLDERS.			LEASEHOLDERS.		DATE of REGISTRY.
	£. 50.	£. 20.	£. 10.	£. 20.	£. 10.	
2,735	413	468	1,082	28	110	October 1832.
10	4	1	3	-	2	January 1833.
29	9	2	11	-	6	March -
102	3	3	95	-	1	June -
48	4	7	33	1	2	October -
9	6	-	2	-	1	January 1834.
34	3	4	20	-	5	March -
12	2	-	4	-	6	June -
24	5	2	17	-	-	October -
6	4	-	2	-	-	January 1835.
40	12	6	18	3	-	March -
8	5	-	2	-	1	June -
12	7	2	3	-	-	October -
6	5	-	1	-	-	March 1836.
1	-	1	-	-	-	June -
180	10	6	120	20	23	October -
24	5	-	19	-	-	January 1837.
3,280	497	502	2,032	52	150	

There were no voters registered at January Sessions 1836.

Total number registered - - - - 3,280.

£. 50 Freeholders	-	-	-	-	497
£. 20 Leaseholders	-	-	-	-	52
£. 20 Freeholders	-	-	-	-	502
£. 10 Leaseholders	-	-	-	-	150
£. 10 Freeholders	-	-	-	-	2,032

Rentscharges - - - - 3,243
38

TOTAL - - - - 3,280

Mathew H. D'Courcy,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

25 February 1837.

LONDONDERRY.

DATE OF REGISTRY.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 20 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	£. 10 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.
10 October 1832	-	-	-	-	9
11 -	6	2	9	-	07
12 -	3	-	1	3	61
13 -	1	1	3	-	5
14 -	11	1	6	-	6
15 -	19	2	12	-	7
16 -	9	-	7	2	95
17 -	5	1	9	1	41
18 -	8	1	6	6	81
19 -	10	-	4	-	7
20 -	18	-	8	-	25

033.

d

(continued)

LONDONDERRY—continued.

Appendix (A.)
No 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

DATE OF REGISTRY.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 30 Leaseholders.	£. 20 Freeholders.	£. 10 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.
24 October 1832	7	-	7	-	20
25	2	-	1	-	9
26	6	2	-	8	3
27	7	-	1	23	28
10 November	24	4	11	3	48
12	15	2	3	21	115
13	13	3	8	2	60
14	12	1	12	1	135
16	8	2	5	54	33
17	5	2	2	113	51
19	4	-	9	49	99
20	2	2	5	17	37
22	1	1	3	16	63
23	5	2	1	16	105
24	3	-	1	3	32
27	3	-	20	17	16
28	2	-	-	44	47
27 December	1	-	1	2	25
31	-	-	-	3	12
4 January 1833	1	-	-	-	-
5	1	-	-	-	-
2 April	6	3	4	-	18
6	1	-	6	-	7
19 June	2	-	-	-	35
24	-	1	-	204	2
16 October	2	-	1	-	3
21	-	-	1	-	1
27 December	1	-	-	-	8
28	1	-	-	-	-
1 January 1834	1	-	-	-	3
2	-	-	-	34	-
3	-	-	-	1	1
2 April	-	20	-	10	1
7	1	-	20	-	12
19 June	1	-	-	1	7
23	1	2	-	-	3
15 October	2	-	1	-	-
20	3	-	-	-	3
29 December	1	2	-	-	16
2 January 1835	2	2	-	12	4
1 April	1	1	-	-	1
6	1	-	1	-	11
25 June	1	-	-	-	20
29	-	1	-	1	15
14 October	1	-	-	-	-
19	-	-	2	-	3
28 December	-	1	-	-	85
1 January 1836	1	1	1	-	10
25 March	-	1	-	-	-
21 June	1	-	-	-	3
27	1	2	-	1	3
18 October	-	-	-	-	-
24	4	-	-	1	1
27 December	2	3	1	6	-

4 March 1837.

James Gregg,
Clerk of the Peace.

LONGFORD.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

DATE OF REGISTRY.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 10. Leaseholders.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 10 Leaseholders.	£. 10. Freeholders.
10, 13, 17 and 21 October and 15 November 1832.	199	11	111	33	948
30 December 1832 and 1 January 1833.	1	-	5	3	31
5 and 8 April - - -	11	-	5	2	38
24 and 26 June - - -	5	-	-	-	14
21 and 23 October - - -	-	-	-	7	13
30 December 1833 and 1 Jan- uary 1834.	-	-	1	-	1
7 and 9 April - - -	4	-	-	11	3
23 and 25 June - - -	3	-	2	-	1
15 October - - -	2	1	1	-	2
23 and 31 December - - -	1	-	-	-	1
6 and 7 April 1835 - - -	11	-	10	21	62
29 and 30 June - - -	7	1	2	1	2
12 and 13 October - - -	2	1	2	2	4
4 and 5 January 1836 - - -	-	-	1	1	2
4 and 5 April - - -	3	1	-	1	16
20 and 21 June - - -	4	-	3	-	8
17 and 18 October - - -	3	1	5	6	30
1 and 3 January 1837 - - -	5	3	2	5	41

John V. Crawford, Clerk of the Peace.

LOUTH.

DATE of REGISTRY.	Total Number Registered at each Date.	Number of £. 50 Freeholders Registered.	Number of £. 10 Leaseholders Registered.	Number of £. 50 Freeholders Registered.	Number of £. 10 Leaseholders Registered.	Number of £. 10 Freeholders Registered.
10 October 1832, being the first Session under 2 and 3 W.M. 4, c. 88.	836	217	11	94	85	428
3 January 1833 -	8	2	-	2	-	4
27 February 1833 at Assizes on appeal.	3	-	1	-	1	1
8 April - 1833	7	3	-	1	-	3
25 June - - -	4	1	-	1	-	2
23 October - - -	6	3	-	-	-	3
1 January - 1834	3	2	-	-	-	1
4 April - - -	3	2	-	-	-	1
24 June - - -	1	1	-	-	-	-
14 October - - -	3	1	-	-	2	-
1 January - 1835	29	7	-	1	-	21
1 April - - -	30	6	-	9	6	9
23 June - - -	9	7	-	1	-	1
20 October - - -	7	2	-	2	-	3
5 January - 1836	11	2	1	1	3	4
15 February 1836, at Assizes on appeal.	1	-	-	-	1	-
8 April - 1836	9	4	-	1	2	2
17 June - - -	2	1	-	-	-	1
13 October - - -	1	-	-	1	-	-
4 January - 1837	3	-	-	1	-	2
TOTAL - - -	975	261	13	115	100	486

Thomas Bourne, Clerk of the Peace.

Appendix (A.)

QUEEN'S COUNTY.

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

Number of £. 20 Freeholders.	Number of £. 10 Leaseholders.	Number of £. 20 Freeholders.	Number of £. 10 Leaseholders.	Number of £. 10 Freeholders.	DATE OF REGISTRY.
294	13	155	45	925	-- Special registry sessions under Irish Reform Act, com- mencing 12th Oct. 1832, and ended 23 Nov. 1832.
5		4		2	28 December 1832.
1		3		2	2 January 1833.
7	1	11	2	13	3 April
18		2		24	9 April
6		2	1	15	20 June
4	1			6	24 June
5		9		7	23 October
9		1		6	29 October
3		1	1	2	2 January 1834.
2		1		1	7 January
4				4	2 April
1		1		3	8 April
1	1			1	19 June
1		2	1	3	24 June
3		1	2	5	15 October
3					22 October
4		13	2	18	1 January 1835.
27	1	35	7	117	6 January
18		20	3	51	31 March
6	1	2	1	2	7 April
9	2	2	2	2	25 June
2		2	1	1	30 June
4	2	6		11	31 December
6		2			5 January 1836.
6		2			5 April
1		1		2	13 April
6		1		6	17 June
1	1	5	3	22	23 June
2		4	2	20	19 October
5	1	8		21	27 October
2		1	1	70	4 January 1837.
					10 January

W. Caldwell,
Clerk of the Peace.

ROSCOMMON.

DATE OF REGISTRY.	Number of £. 20 Freeholders.	Number of £. 10 Leaseholders.	Number of £. 20 Freeholders.	Number of £. 10 Leaseholders.	Number of £. 20 Freeholders.
10 October 1832					
13	39		17	3	14
15	19		7		27
16	27		7	1	17
17	18		5		37
18	8		6		37
19	7		2		26
20	3		4	3	49
22	23	1	6	1	16
23	21	3	5		16
24	11		7	2	37
25	9		2		17
26	19		6	2	28
27	1		9	1	18
29	9		3		19
29	16		11		38
30	7	2	2	1	27

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[29]

DATE OF REGISTRY.	Number of £-50 Freeholders.	Number of £-20 Leaseholders.	Number of £-20 Freeholders.	Number of £-10 Leaseholders.	Number of £-10 Freeholders.
31 October 1832	2	-	1	2	11
1 November	5	-	1	2	14
9	-	-	-	7	20
3	-	1	-	10	13
5	-	-	1	4	12
6	2	-	3	7	29
8	4	1	4	6	32
10	21	-	15	1	49
12	12	-	13	-	56
13	21	-	15	-	128
14	9	-	16	-	102
15	2	-	3	2	46
16	2	-	1	5	54
17	3	-	2	6	35
19	6	-	2	4	44
20	4	-	1	-	47
31 December	1	-	-	-	-
4 January 1833	-	-	-	-	8
26 March	1	-	-	-	-
29	2	-	-	-	9
21 June	2	-	-	-	1
25	2	-	2	-	1
28 October	1	-	1	-	3
4 January 1834	-	-	-	-	1
26 March	2	-	-	-	-
31	1	-	-	-	7
22 June	-	-	-	-	1
25	1	-	-	-	16
21 October	2	-	-	-	22
27	2	-	2	10	22
30 December	2	-	-	-	-
5 January 1835	-	1	-	2	20
28 March	7	-	-	-	4
31	10	-	4	1	9
23 June	3	-	-	-	5
27	2	-	1	-	3
10 July	-	-	-	-	2
21 October	-	-	1	-	1
27	5	-	-	-	3
29 December	4	-	-	-	1
4 January 1836	1	-	-	-	1
16 March	2	-	-	-	-
2 April	2	-	-	-	3
22 June	4	-	1	-	2
28	-	-	3	-	-
10 October	2	-	5	-	3
27	1	-	-	-	1
28 December	5	-	1	11	4
3 January 1837	4	-	2	-	2
3 January 1837	4	-	1	-	-
TOTAL	405	9	201	96	1,287

Appendix (A.)
No. 1.
Votes Registered
in Counties.

Roscommon, 23 February 1837.

John Moros,
Deputy Clerk.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

SLIGO.

DATE OF REGISTRY.	FREEHOLDERS.			LEASEHOLDERS.			RENTCHARGES.		
	£. 50.	£. 25.	£. 10.	£. 50.	£. 25.	£. 10.	£. 50.	£. 25.	£. 10.
October 1832	169	141	367	1	1	3	3	15	
Hilary 1833	14	0	15	—	—	—	—	—	
Easter	8	7	10	—	—	—	—	—	
Summer	2	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	
October	3	6	6	—	—	—	—	—	
Hilary 1834	3	—	9	—	—	—	—	—	2
Easter	1	2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—
Summer	2	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
October	11	2	2	—	—	—	1	—	1
Hilary 1835	4	3	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Easter	6	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Summer	7	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
October	4	—	2	—	—	—	—	1	—
Hilary 1836	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
Easter	4	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—
Summer	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
October	9	10	21	—	3	—	—	—	1
Hilary 1837	16	8	102	—	1	—	—	—	1
	268	195	544	1	5	4	4	20	

1,005 freeholders.
10 leaseholders.
24 rentcharges.

Total - - 1,039

B. W. Wjuse, Clerk of the Peace.

TIPPERARY.

£. 50. Value.	£. 25. Value.	£. 10. Value.	
837	379	1,500	- - freeholders.
16	15	- - -	- - rentcharges.
—	62	228	- - leaseholders.
853	456	1,828	

Total of 50 £. - - - - - 853
Ditto 20 £. - - - - - 456
Ditto 10 £. - - - - - 1,828

Total - - 3,137

All registered between the 1st October 1832 and 1st January 1837.

24 February 1837.

T. Saffier, Clerk of the Peace.

TYRONE.

Appendix (A.)
No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

YEARS.	FREEHOLDERS.			LEASEHOLDERS.		RENTCHARGERS.		TOTAL.
	£10. Value.	£20. Value.	£10. Value.	£. 20.	£. 10.	£. 10.	£. 20.	
1830 -	159	196	742	24	23	-	8	1,151
1835 -	9	22	38	1	1	-	3	74
1834 -	11	5	67	3	-	-	7	93
1836 -	95	103	505	12	13	-	8	736
1836 -	34	17	347	8	9	1	3	419
1837 -	14	4	103	2	-	-	1	124
	322	346	1,805	50	46	1	30	2,600

David Ansell, Clerk of the Peace.

WATERFORD.

SESSIONS, AND DATES OF REGISTRY.	£. 10	£. 20	£. 20	£. 10	£. 10
	Freeholders.	Leaseholders.	Freeholders.	Leaseholders.	Freeholders.
Special Sessions under the Reform Act:					
Waterford - 10 Oct. 1832	22	1	10	1	14
" - 11 Oct. "	15	1	7	1	33
" - 12 Oct. "	21	-	5	5	39
Kilmacshomas, 13 Oct. "	6	1	6	4	32
" - 15 Oct. "	8	-	4	4	36
" - 16 Oct. "	9	-	7	6	49
Dungarvan - 17 Oct. "	19	-	15	5	39
" - 18 Oct. "	20	-	10	7	47
" - 19 Oct. "	12	-	9	7	49
Lismore - 20 Oct. "	13	-	18	6	46
" - 22 Oct. "	19	2	21	7	78
" - 23 Oct. "	14	1	11	5	51
Dungarvan - 31 Oct. "	10	-	8	8	65
" - 1 Nov. "	4	-	2	4	33
" - 2 Nov. "	8	-	5	5	40
" - 3 Nov. "	-	-	1	1	8
Waterford - 5 Nov. "	11	1	12	6	52
" - 6 Nov. "	10	1	5	4	47
" - 7 Nov. "	4	-	3	8	16
Kilmacshomas, 8 Nov. "	-	2	1	23	38
" - 9 Nov. "	2	-	1	15	20
General Sessions of the Peace:					
Waterford - 4 Jan. 1833	1	1	1	-	-
" - 29 Mar. "	-	-	-	-	1
Dungarvan - 1 April "	1	-	-	-	-
Waterford - 21 June "	-	-	1	-	-
" - 11 Oct. "	-	-	1	-	-
Dungarvan - 14 Oct. "	3	-	1	-	2
" - 6 Jun. 1834	2	-	-	1	-
Waterford - 4 April "	2	-	-	-	-
Lismore - 7 April "	-	-	1	-	-
Waterford - 20 June "	1	-	-	-	-
Dungarvan - 23 June "	-	1	-	-	-

(continued)

Appendix (A.)
No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

SESSIONS, AND DATES OF REGISTRY.	£. 50	£. 30	£. 20	£. 10	£. 10
	Freeholders.	Leaseholders.	Freeholders.	Leaseholders.	Freeholders.
Waterford - 10 Oct. 1834	2	-	1	-	-
Lismore - 13 Oct. ---	1	-	-	-	-
Waterford - 2 Jan. 1835	-	-	-	-	1
Dungarvan - 5 Jan. ---	1	-	1	-	-
Waterford - 3 April ---	1	-	-	-	-
Lismore - 6 April ---	3	-	1	-	-
Dungarvan - 29 June ---	-	1	-	-	-
Lismore - 12 Oct. ---	1	-	-	-	-
Waterford - 1 Jan. 1836	1	-	-	-	-
--- - 4 April ---	1	-	-	-	-
Lismore - 8 April ---	2	-	-	1	-
Waterford - 22 June ---	1	-	-	-	-
Dungarvan - 27 June ---	-	-	-	-	1
Lismore - 24 Oct. ---	1	-	1	6	9
Total number registered at and up to the 1st Jan. 1837 -	261	13	170	140	926

10 March 1837.

Bar Delandre, Clerk of the Peace.

FURTHER RETURNS of the Number of Voters Registered in each County in Ireland
since 1st October 1832.

SCHEDULE.

Kerry. Kilbarr. Leitrim.	Mayo. Meath.	Monaghan. Westmeath.	Wexford. Wicklow.
--------------------------------	-----------------	-------------------------	----------------------

My Lord,

Dublin Castle, 4 April 1837.

REFERRING to my communication of the 17th ultimo, transmitting Returns of the number of Voters Registered in each County in Ireland, since 1st October 1832, in pursuance of an Order of the Select Committee on Fictitious Votes, Ireland, I have now the honour to forward farther Returns, which have been since received, for the purpose of being laid before the Committee.

Lord Granville Somerset,
&c. &c. &c.

I have, &c.
T. Drummond.

KERRY.

DATES.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 30 Leaseholders.	£. 20 Freeholders.	£. 10 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	TOTALS.
1832 :						
October - 10	9	2	8	23	50	92
--- - 11	1	-	1	-	4	6
--- - 12	10	-	-	-	3	13
--- - 16	22	2	16	12	30	82
--- - 17	13	-	2	-	2	17
--- - 18	22	-	15	-	9	46
--- - 19	1	-	-	-	-	1
--- - 20	9	-	1	-	2	12
--- - 21	-	-	1	-	1	2
--- - 22	12	7	14	14	7	54
--- - 23	3	-	1	-	-	4
--- - 24	4	-	-	-	1	5
--- - 25	16	2	14	6	44	82
--- - 26	11	-	5	-	15	31
--- - 27	11	-	5	-	16	32

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[33]

DATE.	£ 50 Freeholders.	£ 50 Leaseholders.	£ 20 Freeholders.	£ 10 Leaseholders.	£ 10 Freeholders.	TOTAL.
1832:						
October - 29	10	9	11	8	29	60
— - 30	5	-	9	-	1	8
November 1	20	4	30	1	52	107
— - 2	6	-	5	-	13	24
— - 3	1	-	-	-	-	1
— - 5	7	1	17	1	59	86
— - 6	-	-	1	-	-	1
— - 7	2	-	2	-	-	4
— - 8	-	-	1	-	-	1
— - 10	-	-	1	-	-	1
— - 12	7	-	-	-	-	7
— - 13	33	3	19	22	77	154
— - 14	12	-	5	1	22	40
— - 15	6	1	9	-	6	15
— - 16	4	-	21	-	2	27
— - 17	3	-	5	17	26	51
— - 19	2	-	-	4	8	14
— - 21	-	-	1	-	47	48
— - 22	3	-	-	-	4	7
— - 23	1	-	-	-	-	1
1833:						
January - 4	4	-	5	2	9	20
March - 26	1	-	1	1	1	4
April - 2	1	-	1	-	1	3
June - 21	1	-	-	1	1	3
— - 28	2	-	-	-	-	2
October - 16	1	-	-	-	-	1
— - 21	2	-	-	-	-	2
— - 28	1	-	1	-	-	2
1834:						
March - 27	-	-	1	-	1	2
April - 4	-	-	2	-	-	2
— - 23	-	-	2	-	-	2
October - 21	1	-	2	-	-	3
December 29	-	-	-	-	1	1
1835:						
January - 6	3	1	3	-	2	9
March - 30	4	1	1	-	14	20
April - 7	21	-	4	-	67	92
June - 23	2	1	-	-	-	3
July - 1	4	-	5	-	8	17
October - 15	4	-	-	-	-	4
— - 19	9	-	1	-	4	14
December 25	1	1	-	-	4	6
1836:						
January - 5	1	-	1	-	6	8
March - 27	-	1	-	-	-	1
April - 4	1	-	-	-	-	1
— - 12	4	-	-	-	7	11
June - 27	-	-	-	-	2	2
— - 27	2	-	1	-	-	3
October - 10	10	-	1	7	15	33
— - 18	2	-	21	1	8	33
December 28	-	-	1	4	4	9
1837:						
January - 4	1	-	3	-	2	6
352						
29						
264						
125						
687						
1,467						

Appendix (A.)
No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

J. Crosbie,
Clerk of the Peace.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

KILDARE.

Session when Registered.	£. 50 Freehold.	£. 20 Leasehold.	£. 10 Freehold.	£. 10 Leasehold.	£. 10 Freehold.
At the first or special sessions for the registration of Voters, held under the Reform Act, commencing the 10th of October 1832, and continued by adjournment until the 12th of November following, at the several places throughout said county appointed by the Lord Lieutenant's precept for that purpose - -	213	23	130	165	580
At the quarter sessions at					
Kildare - 2 April 1833	3	—	—	—	—
Athy - 24 June -	1	—	—	—	—
Maynooth 1 July -	1	—	—	—	—
Kildare - 2 April 1834	2	—	—	—	—
Nass - 7 - - -	1	—	—	—	—
Athy - 25 Jans - -	—	—	1	—	—
Maynooth 30 - - -	—	—	1	—	—
Kildare - 10 Oct. -	1	—	—	1	—
Athy - 1 Jan. 1835	1	—	3	—	3
Maynooth 6 - - -	4	—	—	—	1
Kildare - 2 April -	6	—	3	—	1
Nass - 6 - - -	9	2	1	3	—
Athy - 26 June - -	—	—	1	—	1
Maynooth 30 - - -	14	1	1	—	5
Kildare - 16 Oct. -	2	1	—	—	—
Nass - 21 - - -	2	—	—	—	—
Athy - 31 Dec. - -	4	—	3	9	7
Maynooth 3 Jan. 1836	11	—	—	3	1
Kildare - 7 April -	11	—	3	10	10
Nass - 11 - - -	21	3	2	5	15
Athy - 22 June - -	3	—	2	3	3
Maynooth 27 - - -	3	—	—	—	4
Kildare - 13 Oct. -	6	1	3	9	12
Nass - 17 - - -	3	2	1	7	16
Athy - 28 Dec. - -	1	—	1	—	—
Maynooth 2 Jan. 1837	2	1	—	—	—

George Mellicott,
Clerk of the Peace.

LEITRIM.

£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 20 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	£. 10 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	DATES OF REGISTRY.
14	-	6	3	86	10 October 1832.
8	-	9	2	39	13 October -
46	-	64	1	453	17 October -
51	-	35	6	161	31 October -
16	-	19	11	131	5 November -
25	2	15	1	127	9 November -
1	-	-	-	10	9 December -
—	—	2	-	12	27 December -
3	-	-	-	6	8 January 1833.
1	-	2	1	14	26 March -
					2 April -

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND. [33

£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 20 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	£. 5 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	DATES OF REGISTRY.
2	-	2	-	18	18 June - 1833.
3	-	-	-	9	25 - - -
1	-	-	-	5	9 October - -
1	-	-	-	2	10 - - -
-	-	-	-	3	31 December -
-	-	-	-	1	7 January 1834.
-	-	1	-	-	18 March - -
2	-	-	-	-	1 April - - -
-	-	-	-	1	17 June - - -
1	-	2	-	1	24 - - -
-	-	-	-	15	9 October - -
-	-	1	-	-	15 - - -
-	-	-	-	1	30 December -
2	-	-	-	1	6 January 1835.
1	-	3	8	6	7 April - - -
4	-	2	-	2	23 June - - -
4	-	-	-	5	30 - - -
2	-	-	-	-	13 October - -
3	1	1	5	10	20 - - -
3	-	1	-	8	29 December -
2	-	1	1	22	5 January 1836.
1	-	-	-	8	30 March - -
5	-	-	2	20	6 April - - -
1	-	-	-	-	22 June - - -
1	-	-	3	5	29 - - -
-	-	1	1	14	13 October - -
1	-	-	3	45	20 - - -
-	-	2	-	5	28 December -
222	3	169	48	1,840	

 Appendix (A.)
 No. 1.
 Votes Registered
 in Counties.

 Peace Office, Carrick-on-Shannon,
 23 March 1837.

 Alex. Jarvis,
 Clerk of the Peace.

MAYO.

Amount of Freehold.	Year commencing 1st Oct.	Number of Freeholders.	Number of Leaseholders.	Total of 50 l.	Total of 20 l.	Total of 10 l.
Fifty pounds	1832	322	-	403		
Ditto	1833	42	-			
Ditto	1834	12	-			
Ditto	1835	12	-			
Ditto	1836	15	-			
Ditto	1837	1	-			
Twenty pounds	1832	279	2	306		
Ditto	1833	15	-			
Ditto	1834	2	-			
Ditto	1835	5	-			
Ditto	1836	3	-			
Ditto	1837	2	-			
Ten pounds	1832	771	4			1,519
Ditto	1833	264	-			
Ditto	1834	55	2			
Ditto	1835	32	1			
Ditto	1836	183	-			
Ditto	1837	7	-			

 Peace Office, Ballinrobe,
 26 March 1837.

 Th. Gildea,
 Clerk of the Peace.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

MEATH.

GENERAL REGISTRY, Commencing	£. 50	£. 10	£. 50	£. 10	£. 10
	Freeholders.	Leaseholders.	Freeholders.	Leaseholders.	Freeholders.
October 1832 - - -	448	24	204	161	683
Hilary sessions 1833 - - -	9	-	-	3	2
Easter - - - - -	8	-	2	1	8
Summer - - - - -	9	1	-	-	4
October - - - - -	10	-	1	3	8
Hilary - 1834 - - -	2	-	1	1	3
Easter - - - - -	5	-	-	-	1
Summer - - - - -	-	-	-	-	1
October - - - - -	1	1	-	-	1
Hilary - 1835 - - -	4	-	3	1	6
Easter - - - - -	23	1	3	3	13
Summer - - - - -	11	-	2	-	8
October - - - - -	9	1	6	1	12
Hilary - 1836 - - -	14	-	7	12	17
Easter - - - - -	9	-	1	-	11
Summer - - - - -	6	-	2	-	2
October - - - - -	9	5	2	8	20
Hilary - 1837 - - -	7	1	8	4	13

17 March 1837.

Robert Chambers, Clerk of the Peace.

MONAGHAN.

Number of vol. Freeholders.	Number of vol. Leaseholders.	Number of vol. Freeholders.	Number of vol. Leaseholders.	Number of vol. Freeholders.	Place and Date of Registry.
22	1	22	1	97	Monaghan, October 1832.
40	-	19	26	132	Castleblayney - - -
89	3	68	22	436	Monaghan - - -
31	3	38	10	363	Same, November - -
6	1	8	1	36	Clones - - -
17	6	17	387	147	Castleblayney - - -
5	-	1	67	24	Carrickmacross - -
3	-	6	-	76	Castleblayney, Mar. 1833.
3	-	-	2	20	Monaghan, April - -
1	1	-	-	12	Castleblayney, June -
3	-	2	-	34	Monaghan - - -
-	-	-	12	19	Castleblayney, Oct. -
-	-	-	1	9	Monaghan - - -
-	-	-	-	2	Castleblayney, Dec. -
4	-	-	-	31	Monaghan, January 1834.
-	2	-	6	3	Castleblayney, March -
1	-	-	1	72	Monaghan, April - -
2	-	1	2	31	Castleblayney, June -
3	-	1	4	40	Monaghan - - -
2	-	2	11	12	Castleblayney, Oct. -
4	-	2	-	17	Monaghan - - -
3	-	-	-	-	Castleblayney, Dec. -
-	-	1	-	25	Monaghan, January 1835.
-	-	-	2	1	Castleblayney, March -
-	-	1	-	10	Monaghan, April - -
-	-	-	13	4	Castleblayney, June -
3	1	2	8	7	Monaghan, July - -
-	-	1	-	-	Castleblayney, Oct. -
-	1	1	-	23	Monaghan - - -
3	1	-	26	15	Castleblayney, Dec. -
2	-	7	-	50	Monaghan, January 1836.
1	-	-	28	8	Castleblayney, March -
4	-	1	-	31	Monaghan, April - -
-	-	3	5	26	Castleblayney, June -

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[37

Number of 50 L. Freeholders.	Number of 20 L. Leaseholders.	Number of 22 L. Freeholders.	Number of 20 L. Leaseholders.	Number of 22 L. Freeholders.	Place and Date of Registry.
3	-	-	-	69	Monaghan - June 1835.
1	-	-	-	20	Castleblayney, Oct. -
3	1	1	4	18	Monaghan - - -
-	-	-	11	6	Castleblayney, Dec. -
2	-	-	-	2	Monaghan, January 1837.
281	21	198	667	2,056	

Rob. Smith, Clerk of the Peace.

Appendix (A.)

No. 1.
Voters Registered
in Counties.

WESTMEATH.

Freeholders, £ 50.	Leaseholders, £ 20.	Freeholders, £ 22.	Leaseholders, £ 10.	Freeholders, £ 10.	Date of the Registry.
11	-	3	-	24	10 October - 1832.
14	-	2	1	45	11 - - -
13	-	3	-	37	12 - - -
10	-	5	-	48	13 - - -
14	-	10	1	45	15 - - -
6	-	10	1	22	16 - - -
26	-	6	-	66	17 - - -
25	-	12	1	92	18 - - -
29	-	10	-	54	19 - - -
20	-	7	3	47	20 - - -
22	2	9	2	41	22 - - -
14	-	3	2	24	23 - - -
7	-	4	1	20	27 - - -
2	1	2	-	30	29 - - -
4	-	2	1	20	30 - - -
9	2	5	2	24	31 - - -
-	-	5	2	19	1 November - - -
4	-	1	1	6	2 - - -
1	-	1	2	13	3 - - -
1	-	4	1	35	5 - - -
-	-	-	-	13	6 - - -
6	-	-	3	11	10 - - -
3	-	6	2	30	12 - - -
3	1	1	5	26	13 - - -
3	1	3	6	38	14 - - -
3	3	7	3	28	15 - - -
3	-	6	3	47	16 - - -
8	-	2	2	32	17 - - -
1	-	-	-	1	28 December - - -
1	1	1	8	10	3 January - 1833.
2	-	-	-	4	27 March - - -
1	-	1	-	-	28 - - -
1	-	1	1	14	1 April - - -
1	-	1	-	-	18 June - - -
1	-	-	10	16	22 - - -
1	-	-	-	2	18 October - - -
1	-	1	-	11	23 - - -
-	-	-	5	3	27 December - - -
-	-	-	5	7	1 January - 1834.
-	-	1	5	2	31 March - - -
-	-	1	2	7	5 April - - -
-	-	6	-	1	23 June - - -
1	-	1	-	4	27 - - -
-	-	-	2	-	30 December - - -
2	-	1	-	3	5 January - 1835.
-	-	-	1	3	28 March - - -
-	1	-	-	-	31 - - -
-	-	-	-	-	2 April - - -
2	-	-	-	2	3 - - -
-	-	-	-	10	- - -

Appendix (A.)
No. 1,
Veterans Registered
in Counties.

Freeholders, £. 50.	Leaseholders, £. 50.	Freeholders, £. 20.	Leaseholders, £. 10.	Freeholders, £. 10.	Date of the Registry.
1	-	-	-	-	24 June 1835
3	-	-	1	1	30 —
—	—	2	1	4	10 October 1835
—	—	1	-	1	13 —
1	-	-	-	-	16 —
1	-	-	-	-	5 January 1836
1	-	-	-	-	11 —
1	-	1	-	1	5 April —
2	-	-	-	1	11 —
2	1	-	-	-	22 June —
4	-	1	3	9	11 October —
3	—	3	10	36	18 —
1	-	-	4	-	28 December —
—	-	-	-	3	3 January 1837

25 March 1837.

G. FeatherstonH,
Clerk of the Peace.

WEXFORD.

Number of £. 50 Freeholders.	Number of £. 20 Leaseholders.	Number of £. 20 Freeholders.	Number of £. 10 Leaseholders.	Number of £. 10 Freeholders.	Date of Registry.	Total Number.
379	15	226	204	1,007	Oct. & Nov. 1832	2,731
—	—	2	-	-	1 April 1833	2
2	2	-	-	17	6 —	21
1	-	1	-	5	18 June —	7
1	1	1	-	8	22 —	11
2	-	1	-	13	17 October —	16
1	-	-	-	-	28 —	1
—	—	1	-	6	31 Dec. —	7
2	-	-	-	5	4 January 1834	7
—	—	2	-	3	3 April —	5
1	-	-	-	-	9 —	1
—	—	1	1	1	20 June —	3
—	—	1	-	1	25 —	2
2	-	2	-	6	20 October —	10
4	-	2	2	-	25 —	8
1	-	4	1	4	29 Dec. —	10
4	-	-	7	37	1 January 1835	48
1	-	3	2	27	31 March —	33
10	-	6	9	51	8 April —	76
7	1	4	2	54	22 June —	68
4	-	4	1	17	29 —	26
4	-	-	1	6	20 October —	12
6	-	4	2	10	28 —	21
3	-	5	1	8	29 Dec. —	17
5	-	-	-	2	4 January 1836	7
4	-	1	-	1	2 April —	6
1	-	-	-	5	11 —	6
4	-	2	-	2	20 June —	8
2	-	-	1	4	27 —	7
—	—	7	5	9	17 October —	23
2	2	2	-	9	25 —	15
—	—	—	—	3	29 Dec. —	3
3	-	-	5	6	5 January 1837	16
456	21	284	244	2,227		3,234

Anthony Hankins, Clerk of the Peace.

WICKLOW.

Period of each Registry Session since the 1st of October 1832.	Classification of Voters Registered at each Session.					Total Number of Voters registered at each Session, not including Rentermen.
	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 25 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	£. 10 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	
First General Registry sessions, commenced 10th October and ended 27th November 1832	230	25	140	121	1,009	1,525
Hilary Quarter Ses- sions, 1833 - -	3	-	5	2	10	20
Easter - ditto 1833	6	4	5	12	21	48
Summer ditto -	1	-	-	1	-	2
Mich. - ditto -	3	1	-	1	5	10
Hilary - ditto 1834	1	2	1	2	3	9
Easter - ditto -	5	-	1	-	-	6
Summer ditto -	3	-	1	1	3	8
Mich. - ditto -	-	-	-	-	4	4
Hilary - ditto 1835	7	-	-	-	1	8
Easter - ditto -	8	-	1	4	8	21
Summer ditto -	8	-	-	-	9	10
Mich. - ditto -	5	2	1	2	11	21
Hilary - ditto 1836	15	1	6	9	35	66
Easter - ditto -	15	4	2	-	11	32
Summer ditto -	11	-	1	-	3	15
Mich. - ditto -	2	1	2	-	18	23
Hilary - ditto 1837	7	1	2	1	10	21
Total - - -	330	41	168	156	1,154	1,849

22 March 1837.

Samuel Fenton,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

— No. 2. —

Appendix (A.)

My Lord,

Dublin Castle, 5 April 1837.

No. 2.
Voters Registered
in Cities and Towns.

REFERENCE to the Order of the Select Committee, dated 14th February 1837, requiring a Return of the Number of Voters registered in each County of a City or Town in Ireland since the passing of the Irish Reform Act, &c., I am commanded by the Lord Lieutenant to transmit the accompanying Returns, which have been prepared in obedience to the above Order, for the purpose of being laid before the Committee.

Lord Granville Somerset,
&c. &c. &c.

I have, &c.
(signed) T. Drivmond.

A RETURN of the Number of VOTERS REGISTERED in each County of a City or Town in Ireland since the passing of the Irish Reform Act, distinguishing the VOTERS into the CLASSES of FREEHOLDERS, RENTCHARGERS, LEASEHOLDERS, HOUSEHOLDERS and FREEMEN, with the Date of their Registrations respectively.

SCHEDULE.

Carrickfergus, County Town.	Dublin, City.	Limerick, City.
Cork, City.	Galway, County Town.	Londonderry, ditto.
Drogheda, County Town.	Kilkenny, City.	Waterford, ditto.

This Order is complete, with the exception of a Return for the City of Dublin, which the Clerks of the Peace report shall be furnished with the least possible delay.

BOROUGH OF CARRICKFERGUS.

DATE of REGISTRATION.	CLASSES.				
	Freeholders.	Rentchargers.	Leaseholders.	Householders.	Freemen.
Special Sessions, October 1830	34	1	5	101	895
Sessions, January - - - 1833	-	-	-	5	33
— June - - - 1833	-	-	2	11	1
— October - - - 1833	3	-	5	110	—
— January - - - 1834	18	-	5	204	—
— June - - - 1834	-	-	-	3	—
— January - - - 1835	-	-	-	1	2
— June - - - 1835	1	-	1	10	—
— July - - - 1836	-	-	-	2	—
— January - - - 1837	-	-	-	13	—
	56	1	19	451	921

Freeholders	56
Rentchargers	1
Leaseholders	19
Householders	451
Freemen	921

TOTAL Registered Voters - 1,459

March 1837.

Adam Cunningham, Clerk of the Peace
for the County of the Town of Carrickfergus

Appendix (A.)

No. 2.

Voters Registered
in Cities and Towns.

COUNTY OF THE TOWN OF GALWAY.

£. 10 Freeholders.	£. 20 Freeholders.	4s. Freeholders.	£. 10 Leaseholders.	£. 50 Rentscharges.	£. 50 Rentscharges.	£. 20 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	Freemen.	Householders.	Date of Registration.	Total Number of Voters Registered.
75	50	508	11	4	2	5	3	793	511	10 October 1832	—
2	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	13	9	4 April 1833	—
2	—	1	—	—	—	1	—	335	149	26 October 1833	—
2	—	5	—	—	—	—	1	24	3	8 April 1834	—
2	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	32	7	23 October 1834	—
1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	9	34	7 April 1835	—
1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	3	17	25 October 1835	—
1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	3	6 April 1836	—
3	—	—	—	—	—	3	—	2	35	25 October 1836	—
89	53	514	11	4	2	9	4	1,012	568	—	2,753

Galway, 4 March 1837.

John M. O'Hara,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF THE CITY OF KILKENNY.

Date of Registration.									
1832: October	Number of Freeholders of 50 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	33
	Do. - - - - 20 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	20
	Do. - - - - 10 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	5
	Do. - - - - 40 s.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	123
	Rentscharges of 50 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Ditto - 20 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Leaseholders of 20 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Ditto - 10 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	6
	Householders of 10 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7
	Freemen - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	241
		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	131
— December	Freeholder of 50 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Householder of 10 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Freeman - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
1833: April	Freeholder of 40 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Leaseholder of 20 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Householder of 10 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Freeman - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
— June	Freeholder of 50 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Householder of 10 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Freemen - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
— October	Freeholder of 50 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Ditto - 40 s.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Rentscharge of 20 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Freemen - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Householders of 10 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
— December	Freeholder of 40 s.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1834: April	Freeholder of 50 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Ditto - 40 s.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Leaseholder of 10 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Householder of 10 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
	Freeman - - - -	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
— June	Householders of 10 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
— December	Householders of 10 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1835: March	Freeholders of 50 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	4
	Ditto - 20 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
	Ditto - 10 l.	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
		—	—	—	—	—	—	—	7

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[43

Appendix (A.)

No. 2.
Voters Registered
in Cities and Towns.

Date of Registration.									
1835: March	Leaseholder of 20 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Ditto - 10 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
	Householders of 10 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	Freemen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32
									25
									67
- June	Leaseholder of 30 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Householders of 10 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11
	Freeman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
									13
- October	Leaseholder of 30 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Householders of 10 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
	Freeman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
									7
1836: January	Freeholder of 50 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Ditto - 30 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Householders of 10 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
	Freemen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
									8
- March	Freeholder of 50 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Ditto - of 30 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Ditto - of 40 s.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Freemen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
									2
									5
- June	Householders of 10 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46
	Freemen	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
									48
- October	Freeholder of 50 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Ditto - 30 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Ditto - 40 s.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Householders of 10 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3
	Freeman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	47
									1
									51
- December	Freeholder of 50 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
	Householders of 10 l.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9
	Freeman	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
									12
TOTAL Number of Voters Registered . . .									108

Patrick Waters,
Clerk of the Peace.

28 February 1837.

COUNTY OF THE CITY OF LIMERICK.

Freeholders.	Rate-chargers.	Leaseholders.	Householders.	Freemen.	DUTIES.
912	14	34	1,048	280	<i>Vide</i> General List of the Registry, since the passing of the Reform Act, hereunto annexed.

Edward Parker,
Clerk of the Peace.

Appendix (A.)

No. 2.
 Voters Registered
 in Cities and Towns.

CITY OF LONDONDERRY.

Householders.	Freemen.	Date of Registry.	Householders.	Freemen.	Date of Registry.
11	12	2 November 1832.	9	1	20 April 1834.
29	24	3 November 1832.	11	-	15 October 1834.
24	35	5 November 1832.	8	-	29 December 1834.
115	51	6 November 1832.	19	2	1 April 1835.
131	48	7 November 1832.	3	2	25 June 1835.
69	24	8 November 1832.	18	1	14 October 1835.
24	4	9 November 1832.	3	-	28 December 1835.
1	1	10 November 1832.	10	3	29 March 1836.
20	1	27 December 1832.	2	-	21 June 1836.
22	6	2 April 1833.	19	-	18 October 1836.
12	7	16 October 1833.	17	-	27 December 1836.
1	-	27 December 1833.			

4 March 1837.

James Gregg, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF THE CITY OF WATERFORD.

Freeholders.	Rentcharges.	Leaseholders.	Householders.	Freemen.	Date of Registrations.	Total Number Registered.
57	2	19	611	522	October 1832	1,241
1	-	-	1	1	January 1833	3
1	-	-	29	13	March 1833	43
-	-	-	24	23	June 1833	47
1	-	1	16	2	October 1833	20
-	-	-	18	-	January 1834	18
2	-	-	4	3	April 1834	9
2	-	-	33	1	June 1834	36
1	-	-	7	9	October 1834	17
-	-	-	29	11	January 1835	40
6	-	1	36	17	April 1835	60
1	-	1	23	11	June 1835	36
1	-	1	14	6	October 1835	22
1	-	1	35	-	January 1836	37
1	-	1	15	10	April 1836	27
-	-	1	16	7	June 1836	24
2	-	-	19	12	October 1836	32
-	-	-	7	3	December 1836	10
77	2	26	937	682	TOTALS - - -	1,724

E. Cooke, Clerk of the Peace.

— (No. 3.) —

Dublin Castle,
18th March 1837.

My Lord,
 REFERRING to the Order of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, on Fictitious Votes, Ireland, dated 14th February 1837, requiring a Return of the several persons registered in the several Boroughs in Ireland, who have subscribed their affidavits for registry, as marksmen, I have it in command from the Lord Lieutenant to transmit herewith Returns which have been prepared, in obedience to the above Order, for the purpose of being laid before the Committee.

I have the honour to be,
 My Lord,
 Your Lordship's most obedient humble servant,

Lord G. C. H. Somerset, &c. &c. &c.
 Chairman Select Committee on
 Fictitious Votes, Ireland.

T. Drummond.

A RETURN of the several PERSONS REGISTERED in the several BOROUGHs in Ireland, sending Members to Parliament, who have subscribed their Affidavits for Registry as Marksmen.

SCHEDULE.

Armagh Borough.	Coleraine.	Kinsale.
Athlone.	Downpatrick and Newry.	New Ross.
Banconbridge.	Drogheda.	Portlinton.
Belfast.	Dundalk.	Sligo.
Carlow.	Dungarvan.	Trillick.
Carrickfergus.	Dungannon.	Wexford.
Cashel.	Ennis.	Youghal.
Clonsilla.	Enniskillen.	

BOROUGH OF ARMAUGH.

Abbott, John, Barrackwell.	Dougan, James, Charter-school-lane.	Hughes, Patrick, Scotch-st.
Allen, John, Lincenhall-street.	Donnelly, Bernard, Dawson-street.	Hamil, Patrick, Ogle-street.
Acheson, James, Market-st.	Dreinan, John, Mill-street.	Hughes, Hugh, Ogle-street.
Braigen, Arthur, Upper English-street.	Devine, James, Scotch-st.	Hughes, George, Irish-street.
Baxter, Moses, Irish-street.	Douglass, John, Thomas-st.	Jones, William, Lower English-street.
Benson, Jonathan, Barrack-hill.	Doris, John, Barrack-street.	Kelly, Peter, Lower English-street.
Bonner, David, Ogle-street.	Dooly, Patrick, Market-street.	Kesting, Bernard, Castle-st.
Browne, John, Barrack-hill.	Elliott, William, Dawson-st.	Kelgar, Patrick, Castle-street.
Corrigan, Murtha, Market-st.	Ewing, Andrew, Abbey-st.	Lamb, Henry, Dawson-street.
Con, Francis, Barrack-street.	Elliott, William, Dawson-st.	Lennon, Francis, Market-st.
Crilly, James, Castle-street.	Flanigan, Daniel, Castle-st.	Maddole, Samuel, Castle-st.
Collins, Bryan, Irish-street.	Fanning, Edward, Barrack-st.	Madden, Edward, Lisnally-lane.
Card, Joseph, Charter-school-lane.	Farnan, Thomas, Market-st.	Mallon, John, Barrack-well.
Casban, John, Irish-street.	Graham, Patrick, Abbey-lane.	Molloy, John, Irish-street.
Creeley, John, Abbey-lane.	Grimes, William, Callan-st.	McDowell, The., Barrack-hill.
Collins, James, Lincenhall-st.	Grew, Patrick, Lower English-street.	Maxwell, James, Barrack-hill.
Corrigan, Murtha, Scotch-st.	Graham, Lackey, Lower English-street.	Mooney, Henry, Lower English-street.
Cur, Patrick, Barrack-street.	Grew, John, Barrack-hill.	Magowan, William, Barrack-hill.
Carty, John, Ogle-street.	Hughes, Felix, Mill-street.	
Dodd, Thomas, Thomas-st.		
Douglas, John, Ogle-street.		

Appendix (A.)
No. 3.
Persons Registered
as Marksmen.

Moore, Henry, Lower English-street.	M'Gurgan, James, Callan-st.	Pellow, Thomas, Irish-street.
Maxwell, Samuel, Linnhall-street.	M'Gordia, Robert, Linnhall-street.	Quin, Ennia, Barrack-hill.
Monsghan, Edward, Lower English-street.	M'Coranck, Peter, Dawson-street.	Quin, Patrick, Ogle-street.
Morris, Patrick, Market-st.	M'Ginity, Philip, Market-st.	Quin, Bernard, Lower English-street.
M'Caan, Thomas, Linnhall-street.	M'Caan, Thos. Barrack-hill.	Quin, Charles, Gallows-hill.
M'Mahan, Terence, Market-street.	M'Gurk, Arthur, Irish-street.	Rogers, James, Irish-street.
M'Ginity, Philip, Market-st.	M'Keena, James, Barrack-st.	Ralph, William, Barrack-hill.
M'Gloughlin, Henry, Thomas-street.	M'Curragher, John, Primrose-street.	Rice, Patrick, Charter-school-lane.
M'Gwigan, Edward, Callan-street.	M'Connell, W. Barrack-hill.	Rice, Philip, Ogle-street.
M'Gaghey, Peter, Lower English-street.	Norton, John, Callan-street.	Rankin, Robert, Barrack-hill.
M'Keena, Peter, Lower English-street.	Nelson, Samuel, Barrackwell-lane.	Short, Bernard, Ogle-street.
M'Corrick, Francis, ditto.	O'Neill, William, Lower English-street.	Summersville, John, Barrack-street.
M'Connell, Daniel, ditto.	O'Neill, Charles, Linnhall-st.	Slavin, Francis, Lower English-street.
M'Kew, Patrick, ditto.	Peebles, Robert, Upper English-street.	Taggart, John, Lower English-street.
		Watson, Wm. Barrack-street.

Registered in the Borough since Reform Act - - - - 700

Leonard Dobbin, jun., Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF AYLONE.

1. Burke, Edward.	15. Kenny, John.	23. M'Guinness, Edward.
2. Ballentine, William.	16. Kenny, Patrick.	24. M'Court, Patrick.
3. Coyle, Michael.	17. Keighry, Edward.	25. M'Kowen, Daniel.
4. Cusley, Michael.	18. Killduff, Thomas.	26. O'Sullivan, James.
5. Clougher, John.	19. Kenny, John.	27. O'Reilly, Michael.
6. Clarke, Thomas.	20. Keegan, Patrick.	28. O'Reilly, Michael.
7. Devine, John.	21. Lennon, John.	29. Piercy, William.
8. Donnelly, Daniell.	22. Lawler, James.	30. Quinn, Marks.
9. Denny, David.	23. Leard, Christopher.	31. Roper, James.
10. Fitzmaurice, Thomas.	24. Larkin, James.	32. Roche, James.
11. Fisher, William.	25. M'Court, Patrick.	33. Ryan, Michael.
12. Hawkins, James.	26. Moran, James.	34. Swanny, Owen.
13. Histen, Thomas.	27. Mangan, Lawrence.	35. Smith, Charles.
14. Hand, John.		

25 March 1837.

G. FetherstonH, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF BANDON BRIDGE.

No.	N A M E	RESIDENCE.	OCCUPATION.
1	Stephen Sullivan	Bandon	mason.
2	Michael Murphy	Castle-street, Bandon	publican.
3	Daniel Murphy	Bandon	yeoman.
4	Timothy M'Carthy	ditto	gardener.
5	Timothy Mahony	ditto	labourer.
6	Daniel Murphy	ditto	publican.
7	Daniel M'Carthy	ditto	yeoman.
8	Robert Morris	ditto	baker.
9	Jeremiah Hart	ditto	gardener.
10	James Good	ditto	wool-comber
11	John Desmond	ditto	—
12	Cornelius Dessy	ditto	yeoman.
13	Timothy Driscoll	ditto	blacksmith.
14	Denis Collins	ditto	gardener.
15	David Buckley	ditto	yeoman.
16	Timothy Lennon	ditto	weaver.
17	Richard Lessou	ditto	yeoman.

28 February 1837.

James Chatterton,
Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF BELFAST.

Appendix (A.)

No. 3.

Persons Registered
as Marksmen.

Adams, Samuel.	Ferguson, Hamilton.	Kelly, James.	M'Kenny, Daniel.
Ardler, David.	Ferguson, John.	Lough, James.	M'Dada, John.
Adams, John.	Fennor, Edward.	Loughran, Michael.	Nury, John.
Aherlin, James.	Faneill, Timothy.	Loughran, Felix.	Nury, John.
Adrian, Robert.	Ferguson, Hamilton.	Linden, Mathew.	Nuson, James.
Blackwood, John.	Finlay, John.	Linden, Thos. Henry.	O'Neill, Francis.
Bales, Andrew.	Fitzpatrick, William.	Loughran, Joseph.	Orr, David.
Benson, John.	Gallogher, Alexander.	Martin, William.	Obrer, Elijah.
Billington, John.	Gregory, Owen.	Mowherney, Thomas.	O'Brien, James.
Bales, Andrew.	Godfrey, Andrew.	Mulholland, John.	O'Neill, James.
Bones, William.	Gallogher, Charles.	Mills, John.	O'Neill, Constantine.
Bennett, John.	Gilliland, Thomas.	Molten, John.	Polsa, James.
Byrne, Neal.	Gribbin, John.	Martin, Hamilton.	Ross, Andrew.
Boys, Patrick.	Graham, Walter.	Machessney, John.	Roalston, Moses.
Boten, George.	Graham, Robert.	Manay, John.	Rice, Arthur.
Coulter, John.	Hall, James.	Malton, Michael.	Robinson, Hugh.
Conroy, Bernard.	Haughy, John.	Mallikin, James.	Rogers, William.
Cooney, Michael.	Hagan, Michael.	Megovern, Philip.	Rice, William.
Coulter, Daniel.	Hamste, Patrick.	Morgan, John.	Robinson, Robert.
Campbell, Francis.	Harkin, John, sen.	Moore, William.	Rulla, Alexander.
Cornolly, Patrick.	Harper, Alexander.	Morgan, James.	Rainey, John.
Campbell, Hugh.	Hind, George.	Maguire, Owen.	Ruiney, Valentine.
Cherry, Robert.	Holland, Patrick.	Markwood, Thomas.	Rodgers, Hugh.
Corrygham, Waddell.	Hurkin, Peter.	Montgomery, Wm.	Russell, Patrick.
Cassidy, Owen.	Hurthorn, Richard.	Marshall, Joseph.	Reid, John.
Conolly, Patrick.	Homessey, Charles.	Magee, John.	Rosbottom, James.
Campbell, Patrick.	Hempse, Edward.	M'Analey, William.	Reynolds, Bernard.
Carnes, Duncan.	Haughy, James.	M'Cann, Owen.	Robinson, Robert.
Cash, Patrick.	Harraty, Patrick.	M'Guchia, James.	Rodgers, Hugh.
Campbell, William.	Huddleston, William.	M'Cutcheon, Samuel.	Saunders, Thomas.
Campbell, Francis.	Hunter, Francis.	M'Neill, Neal.	Smith, William.
Craig, John.	Harcourt, George.	M'Kenna, Fergus.	Sloan, Robert.
Dogberry, Joseph.	Houston, William.	M'Shane, Edward.	Swan, John.
Deserby, Francis.	Huddleston, William.	M'Cashen, James.	Smith, Patrick.
Derin, Thomas.	Hines, Andrew.	M'Manus, Constant.	School, Edward.
Doran, Hugh.	Haughy, James.	M'Quillen, Edward.	Sloan, Robert.
Bernas, John.	Harkin, Patrick.	M'Chetock, Robert.	Simms, Russel.
Dorely, Edward.	Johnston, John.	M'Dada, Charles.	Stewart, Hugh.
Dougherty, Charles.	Jackson, Thomas.	M'Kenna, Patrick.	Smith, John.
Byer, Daniel.	Junkin, Andrew.	M'Donald, Alex.	Sheny, Owen.
Deagan, John.	Johnston, John.	M'Veagh, Hugh.	Troin, Edward.
Dolan, Miles.	Johnston, Thomas.	M'Gowan, John.	Turnly, Owen.
Duff, Roger.	Johnston, James.	M'Avoy, Patrick.	Trevor, Bernard.
Duffy, Hugh.	Kerr, Michael.	M'Chase, Robert.	Toner, Hugh.
Dougherty, Joseph.	Kernan, James.	M'Callister, Constant.	Taylor, John.
Duggan, John.	Kelly, Roger.	M'Bradley, Dominick.	Tate, John.
Dunne, Robert.	Kyles, John.	M'Spanton, Alex.	Thompson, John.
Duff, Michael.	Kelly, Michael.	M'Grane, Arthur.	Telford, Hamilton.
Daly, Patrick.	Kerr, Michael.	M'Tear, Henry.	Wilson, James.
Duggan, John.	Kennedy, James.	M'Kinsley, Samuel.	Withers, Alexander.
Ewart, Francis.	Kerr, John.	M'Irvine, John.	Walker, William.
Elson, John.	Kane, Thomas.	M'Cube, Francis.	Wm, George.
Ferguson, John.	Kieran, Patrick.	M'Anally, Patrick.	Young, James.

In all 212 Marksmen registered in the Borough of Belfast. Extracted from 3,631 Affidavits; some of them double and treble Registries.

3 March 1907.

S. Doran, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF CARLOW.

The Number of Persons Registered in the Borough of Carlow who have subscribed their Affidavits of Registry as Marksmen is - - - - 54.

A. J. Humphrey, Clerk of the Peace.

Appendix (A.)

No. 3.
Persons Registered
as Marksmen.

BOROUGH OF CARRICKFERGUS.

Number of persons who have subscribed their affidavits of registry as marksmen - 353
March 1837. Adam Cunningham, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF CASHEL.

- | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Burke, Thomas. 7. Butler, Tobias. 10. Barry, John. 11. Barry, Andrew. 2. Carew, Thomas. 3. Casheon, Robert. 11. Cunningham, Richard. 19. Cashin, William. 23. Cummins, Richard. 30. Connors, John. 31. Connors, James. 36. Connell, James. 41. Cummins, Michael. 1. Duggan, John. 4. Dwyer, William. 9. Duggan, Denis. 3. Elliot, James. 5. Fennessy, Patrick. 6. Fleming, Thomas. 7. Farrell, Edmund. 13. Foley, John. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Gleeson, John. 3. Grady, Michael. 7. Gleeson, Michael. 9. Gleeson, William. 13. Holly, John. 17. Hanning, Peter. 22. Hogan, Thomas. 29. Hackett, William. 35. Hurly, William. 1. Kennedy, Edmond. 2. Keating, John. 4. Kissane, Lewis. 5. Kennedy, Richard. 7. Kennedy, Thomas. 8. Kennedy, Darby. 12. Keating, Thomas. 14. Keating, John. 15. Kennedy, Edmond. 30. Kennedy, William. 27. Keating, James. 1. Lynch, Michael. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Loohey, Thomas. 8. Loughman, John. 11. Leonard, Patrick. 12. Loohey, Maurice. 7. Morrissey, Michael. 18. Magrath, Michael. 18. McElroy, William. 30. Morrissey, Richard. 1. Prendergast, William. 2. Pyke, Thomas. 5. Purtil, Michael. 9. Ryan, Patrick. 10. Ryan, Darby. 11. Roche, John. 16. Ryan, William. 1. Stapleton, Michael. 7. Sadler, John. 1. Tubridy, John. 1. Walsh, William. |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

I certify that the foregoing is a true return of the several persons registered as electors for the borough of Cashel, in the county of Tipperary, who have subscribed their affidavits for registry as marksmen.

Peace-office, county of Tipperary, }
23 February 1837.

T. Sadler, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF CLONMEL.

- | | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Armstrong, Andrew. 8. Blinshfield, Garrett. 9. Bagg, John. 29. Benchamp, John. 23. Barrett, Michael. 30. Burke, Patrick. 32. Brett, Thomas. 44. Butler, Richard. 57. Bagg, Michael. 59. Barrett, Timothy. 68. Brien, William. 69. Bowke, John. 5. Crotty, Paul. 7. Connors, Michael. 12. Carew, Timothy. 14. Callaghan, Martin. 20. Carver, William. 40. Collins, John. 61. Cashin, James. 64. Cashin, Laurence. 74. Curry, Jeremiah. 81. Casey, James. 87. Conway, Walter. 26. Dorsey, Michael. 36. Darmody, John. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 46. Day, Edmond. 1. Everard, Thomas. 3. Fitzpatrick, Maurice. 12. Fleming, James. 17. Fennell, William. 20. Fitzpatrick, John. 27. Foley, Michael. 28. Gorman, William. 41. Gualfoyle, Michael. 4. Hogan, James. 36. Houlahan, John. 45. Hayes, John. 14. Keefe, Michael. 29. Kendrick, Edmond. 24. Loneragan, Thomas. 18. M'Isacry, James. 31. Mara, Stephen. 35. Mara, Michael. 37. Murphy, Michael. 38. Moroney, Thomas. 40. Mackin, Edward. 50. M'Donnell, Thomas. 77. M'Grath, Patrick. 3. O'Meagher, Richard. 5. Power, James. | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20. Parker, Samuel. 23. Purcell, William. 24. Power, Thomas. 37. Power, Michael. 40. Parker, Samuel. 2. Quinnan, Mathew J. 4. Quirk, John. 5. Russell, Gerald. 6. Russell, Edmond. 3. Sheehan, Denis. 3. Shortis, Thomas. 6. Sullivan, Owen. 26. Skiffington, Michael. 41. Singleton, William. 48. Sullivan, Cornelius. 58. Spillane, Patrick. 64. Sullivan, Cornelius. 70. Smith, James. 12. Toole, Patrick. 1. Walsh, Thomas. 4. Wholohan, James. 17. White, William. 26. Walsh, John. |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

I certify that the foregoing is a true return of the several persons registered as electors for the borough of Clonmel, in the county of Tipperary, who have subscribed their affidavits for registry as marksmen.

Peace-office, county of Tipperary, }
23 February 1837.

T. Sadler, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF COLERAINE.

Appendix (A.)

No. 3.
Persons Registered
as Marksmen.

NAME.	OCCUPATION.	FREEMAN.	HOUSEHOLDER.
Daniel Barr	spirit dealer	-	householder.
William Bradley	shoemaker	-	-
John Bradley	publican	-	-
George Doherty	farmer	-	-
Patrick Dempsey	dealer	-	-
George Doherty	carrier	-	-
James Flanagan	nailer	-	-
Richard Hughes	publican	-	-
Alexander Hamilton	publican	-	-
John Hunter	farmer	-	-
Richard Hughes	butcher	-	-
Samuel Hamphill	grocer	-	-
James Kane	farmer	-	-
Hugh Kane	dealer	-	-
John Keely	carrier	-	-
Felix M'Ghee	shoemaker	-	-
Henry Miller	farmer	-	-
Thomas Macky	farmer	-	-
John Mitchell	weaver	-	-
Terence M'Gowan	spirit dealer	-	-
William Mitchell	publican	-	-
Francis Mullan	dealer	-	-
David M'Zabb	dealer	-	-
Rector M'Caughan	yeoman	-	-
James Patterson	publican	-	-
John Quigley	farmer	-	-
John Robinson	dealer	-	-
Samuel Sanyly	yeoman	-	-
James Taylor	farmer	-	-

4 March 1837.

James Gregg, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF DOWNPATRICK AND NEWRY.

Borough of Downpatrick.

1. Becket, William.	34. Graham, George.	67. Magrean, Daniel.
2. Beatty, Vincent.	35. George, John.	68. Magreevy, Michael.
3. Behill, John.	36. George, Charles.	69. M'Creedy, Mathew.
4. Bracey, James.	37. Graham, Arthur.	70. M'Donnell, Alexander.
5. Bruney, Hugh.	38. Gilmore, James.	71. M'Creanor, John.
6. Bell, Hugh.	39. Hanna, Edward.	72. M'Creanor, James.
7. Carberry, James.	40. Hughes, Thomas.	73. M'Comb, John.
8. Cross, Bernard.	41. Hart, James.	74. M'Conan, Philip.
9. Collins, Robert.	42. Heavey, James.	75. M'Manus, Hugh.
10. Campbell, Patrick.	43. Hanna, James.	76. M'Hural, William.
11. Cawil, William.	44. Henry, Henry.	77. M'Keown, Hugh.
12. Crangle, John.	45. Jordan, Thomas.	78. M'Cheskey, Paul.
13. Carriston, Edward.	46. Johnston, William.	79. M'Curran, John.
14. Connor, Neil.	47. Kemp, Robert.	80. M'Kettlan, Henry.
15. Cross, Patrick.	48. Kelly, Edward.	81. M'Cracken, George.
16. Carriston, Terence.	49. Keown, John.	82. M'Lindon, Henry.
17. Connor, Edward.	50. Killen, Peter.	83. M'Caia, Patrick.
18. Dougherty, James.	51. Lewis, James.	84. M'Cumiskey, Hugh.
19. Dawson, Alexander.	52. Lavery, Edward.	85. M'Kee, William.
20. Dorman, John.	53. Lackey, William.	86. Napier, Samuel.
21. Dougherty, Arthur.	54. Lennon, James.	87. Nixon, Hugh.
22. Darby, Roger.	55. Milligan, James.	88. Osborne, Thomas.
23. Digby, James.	56. Milligan, William.	89. Pake, Samuel.
24. Doyle, Mathew.	57. Magreevy, Hugh.	90. Peisicrew, Thomas.
25. Dunsbar, Michael.	58. Morgan, Edward.	91. Pendergost, Richard.
26. Eagleson, Roger.	59. McEist, John.	92. Potter, William.
27. Erskel, Abraham.	60. Moffett, Hans.	93. Powell, Thomas.
28. Fitzsimons, John.	61. Magenis, Hugh.	94. Quin, Thomas.
29. Fitzsimons, Nicholas.	62. Malcoe, Richard.	95. Robinson, Mungo.
30. Fitzsimons, Patrick.	63. Mooney, Bernard.	96. Rogan, Michael.
31. Fleming, Daniel.	64. Magran, James.	97. Rogan, Michael.
32. Foster, James.	65. Magillford, Alexander.	98. Savage, Francis.
33. Finlay, William.	66. Magreevy, Hugh.	99. Smyth, George.

Appendix (A.)
 No. 3.
 Persons Registered
 as Mariners.

100. Sloan, Patrick.
 101. Smyth, Thomas.
 102. Smyth, John.
 103. Taggart, John.
 104. Taylor, Robert.

105. Williamson, Henry.
 106. Williams, Charles.
 107. Wisiker, John.
 108. Walsh, Nicholas.
 109. Waterson, Edward.

110. Watson, Edward.
 111. Wari, Peter.
 112. Whyte, James.
 113. Ward, Patrick.
 114. Watterson, Edward.

Borough of Newry.

1. Allen, James.
 2. Armstrong, James.
 3. Anderson, Samuel.
 4. Anderson, William.
 5. Anderson, Alexander.
 6. Brenton, Thomas.
 7. Barry, Hugh.
 8. Brown, Samuel.
 9. Bradley, William.
 10. Brady, David.
 11. Bennett, Bernard.
 12. Boyle, Patrick.
 13. Berry, Redmond.
 14. Brew, Thomas.
 15. Boyle, Michael.
 16. Brew, Thomas.
 17. Callaghan, Patrick.
 18. Callaghan, Bernard.
 19. Cowan, Patrick.
 20. Cullison, Mathew.
 21. Connor, Patrick.
 22. Campbell, John.
 23. Campbell, Bernard.
 24. Connolly, Patrick.
 25. Campbell, Joseph.
 26. Campbell, John.
 27. Connolly, Terence.
 28. Craig, Moses.
 29. Campbell, George.
 30. Campbell, James.
 31. Cosgrove, Edward.
 32. Connolly, Hugh.
 33. Curran, Patrick.
 34. Connolly, Owen.
 35. Collins, Patrick.
 36. Campbell, Edward.
 37. Cunningham, Thomas.
 38. Campbell, Thomas.
 39. Cummins, Samuel.
 40. Coaherry, John.
 41. Cumming, Stephen.
 42. Campbell, Patrick.
 43. Chambers, Samuel.
 44. Dooty, Patrick.
 45. Delaney, Patrick.
 46. Donnelly, Owen.
 47. Dooleghan, Patrick.
 48. Downey, Owen.
 49. Dooin, John.
 50. Dooin, John.
 51. Duffey, Peter.
 52. Dempsey, Terence.
 53. Drungcole, Thomas.
 54. Donnelly, Owen.
 55. Elliot, Patrick.
 56. Freeman, Simon.
 57. Fitzgibbon, Edward.
 58. Fegan, Owen.
 59. Freshers, Samuel.
 60. Fannin, James.
 61. Flanagan, Bernard.
 62. Fannier, James.
 63. Fair, Michael.
 64. Faloon, Owen.
 65. Fegan, Samuel.
 66. Fegan, Edward.

67. Fair, Michael.
 68. Garvey, John.
 69. Griffin, James.
 70. Heaney, John.
 71. Hamilton, Robert.
 72. Hughes, Bernard.
 73. Hand, Charles.
 74. Hale, Richard.
 75. Havern, William.
 76. Henessey, David.
 77. Haversal, Patrick.
 78. Havern, Daniel.
 79. Hall, Charles.
 80. Havens, Charles.
 81. Hoey, William.
 82. Hamel, John.
 83. Haughey, Daniel.
 84. Havern, John.
 85. Hutton, Francis.
 86. Hughes, Henry.
 87. Havern, John.
 88. Harvey, Terence.
 89. Harlin, George.
 90. Haughey, Patrick.
 91. Hamilton, William.
 92. Hale, Richard.
 93. Hughes, Bernard.
 94. Ingle, Thomas.
 95. Jennett, James.
 96. Jordan, Thomas.
 97. Kelly, Hugh.
 98. Kane, James.
 99. Kelly, James.
 100. Kelly, Laurence.
 101. Kerr, William.
 102. Kelly, Arthur.
 103. Kelly, Edward.
 104. Kearns, Hugh.
 105. Kane, Thomas.
 106. Kelly, Arthur.
 107. Kearns, Hugh.
 108. Lynch, Edward.
 109. Loughran, Murtagh.
 110. Lavery, Daniel.
 111. Lamb, James.
 112. Loughran, Terence.
 113. Loughran, David.
 114. Lavery, John.
 115. Lee, Isaac.
 116. Loughran, Patrick.
 117. Lawrence, John.
 118. Loughran, Hugh.
 119. Loughran, Terence.
 120. Lyons, Thomas.
 121. Magee, Patrick.
 122. Markey, John.
 123. Manon, Michael.
 124. Malone, Joseph.
 125. Murdough, John.
 126. Minchan, Michael.
 127. Magee, Dominick.
 128. Mooney, Hugh.
 129. Maguire, James.
 130. Markey, Michael.
 131. Maxwell, David.
 132. Mitchell, James.

133. Mulligan, Patrick.
 134. Morges, Patrick.
 135. Murphy, Stephen.
 136. Moore, Robert.
 137. Magos, Thomas.
 138. Mullin, Edward.
 139. Moslin, Philip.
 140. Morgan, Daniel.
 141. Magrafin, Hugh.
 142. Magarry, John.
 143. Magians, Roger.
 144. Mahter, Patrick.
 145. Moegan, James.
 146. Mooney, Daniel.
 147. Minchan, Owen.
 148. Macken, James.
 149. Maginis, Arthur.
 150. Magurk, John.
 151. Marren, Denis.
 152. Mallon, Stephen.
 153. Murphy, Patrick.
 154. Mallon, Michael.
 155. Moegan, Charles.
 156. Muller, Owen.
 157. Mallon, Michael.
 158. Monaghan, Andrew.
 159. Maguigan, Patrick.
 160. M'Pauan, Thomas.
 161. M'Grath, Miles.
 162. M'Kevitt, Terence.
 163. M'Namee, Patrick.
 164. M'Shane, James.
 165. M'Knight, Thomas.
 166. M'Alcary, James.
 167. M'Atter, Edward.
 168. M'Donnell, Arthur.
 169. M'Shane, Terence.
 170. M'Creaner, Arthur.
 171. M'Keown, Edward.
 172. M'Alcary, Christopher.
 173. M'Atter, John.
 174. M'Guigan, James.
 175. M'Camley, Terence.
 176. M'Guigan, Patrick.
 177. M'Avoy, Patrick.
 178. M'Atter, John.
 179. M'Knight, John.
 180. M'Atter, Patrick.
 181. M'Atter, William.
 182. M'Gwergan, James.
 183. M'Kevitt, Mathew.
 184. M'Kevitt, Charles.
 185. M'Atter, Hugh.
 186. M'Cracken, Andrew.
 187. M'Coovill, Patrick.
 188. M'Nichol, Arthur.
 189. M'Atter, John.
 190. M'Atter, Michael.
 191. M'Atter, Felix.
 192. M'Atter, Patrick.
 193. M'Atter, Owen.
 194. M'Gwergan, Thomas.
 195. M'Nasty, William.
 196. M'Neil, John.
 197. M'Anulty, James.
 198. M'Neil, Neal.

290. M'Annly, Michael.	227. M'Corwill, Michael.	255. Roundtree, Patrick.
291. M'Donnell, Thomas.	228. M'Alindon, William.	256. Rooney, James.
292. M'Annly, Francis.	229. M'Parlin, Michael.	257. Russell, James.
293. M'Atcer, Arthur.	230. M'Atcer, Owen.	258. Savage, James.
294. M'Patan, Terence.	231. M'Nally, Michael.	259. Sheerin, Patrick.
295. M'Mullan, Alexander.	232. M'Annly, Patrick.	260. Smyth, Owen.
296. M'Carery, Nicholas.	233. Norrett, John.	261. Scott, David.
297. M'Donnell, Patrick.	234. Nunnsey, Edward.	262. Scott, William.
298. M'Curry, James.	235. O'Neil, Francis.	263. Smyth, Henry.
299. M'Coy, Andrew.	236. O'Neil, James.	264. Snyth, Patrick.
300. M'Key, David.	237. Oseburg, Henry.	265. Savage, Mark.
301. M'Ceer, Thomas.	238. O'Hagan, Hugh.	266. Smyth, Patrick.
302. M'Cosfery, John.	239. O'Neill, James.	267. Savage, James.
303. M'Parlin, Cornick.	240. O'Hare, Bernard.	268. Smyth, Thomas.
304. M'Guigan, Michael.	241. O'Hare, John.	269. Sheerin, Patrick.
305. M'Gimoty, Bernard.	242. O'Hanon, Patrick.	270. Sheerin, Patrick.
306. M'Kinley, Patrick.	243. O'Hare, Arthur.	271. Treanor, Daniel.
307. M'Shane, Richard.	244. O'Hare, Patrick.	272. Thompson, William.
308. M'Nassara, John.	245. O'Neill, James.	273. Treanor, John.
309. M'Atcer, John.	246. Owens, Henry.	274. Thornton, Michael.
310. M'Key, Thomas.	247. O'Neil, Francis.	275. Treanor, Patrick.
311. M'Kinley, James.	248. Price, Bernard.	276. Tomas, Patrick.
312. M'Mahon, Constantine.	249. Quin, Thomas.	277. Trainor, Patrick.
313. M'Keena, John.	250. Quin, John.	278. Teal, Owen.
314. M'Connock, John.	251. Rowan, James.	279. Teal, Hugh.
315. M'Creaghan, Robert.	252. Roddy, Patrick.	280. Whyte, William.
316. M'Coy, Mathew.	253. Rourke, John.	281. Weir, Robert.
317. M'Grath, Richard.	254. Reid, James.	282. White, Robert.

Appendix (A.)
No. 3.
Persons Registered
as Marksmen.

10 March 1837.

J. & R. Craig, Clerks of the Peace.

COUNTY OF THE TOWN OF DROGHEDA.

No.	Name of Person Registered.	DATE of REGISTRY.	Under what Right Registered.
1.	Allen, Richard	10 October 1832	householder - - 10 l.
2.	Byrne, Michael	12 - - - -	householder - - 10 l.
3.	Brien, Patrick	13 - - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
4.	Bowens, John	13 - - - -	householder - - 10 l.
4.	Bray, Patrick	15 - - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
4.	Byrne, Owen	15 - - - -	householder - - 10 l.
7.	Byrne, Henry	16 - - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
8.	Bennigan, Michael	18 - - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
9.	Bryon, Thomas	17 - - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
10.	Barron, Patrick	18 - - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
11.	Byrne, Thomas	26 February 1833	freeholder - - 40 s.
12.	Bellard, John	26 - - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
13.	Burke, James	11 July - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
14.	Byrne, John	11 - - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
14.	Bowens, John	4 January 1833	householder - - 10 l.
16.	Crawford, George	1 November 1832	householder - - 10 l.
17.	Cooke, John	20 October - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
18.	Curry, John	20 - - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
19.	Crilly, James	1 November - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
20.	Cooke, Benjamin	1 - - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
21.	Cowley, John	2 - - - -	householder - - 10 l.
22.	Callaghan, John	22 October - -	householder - - 10 l.
23.	Carlan, Thomas	23 - - - -	householder - - 10 l.
24.	Clarke, James	1 November - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
25.	Callaghan, Thomas	23 October - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
26.	Callaghan, Michael	23 - - - -	householder - - 10 l.
27.	Callan, Thomas	24 - - - -	householder - - 10 l.
28.	Campbell, John	24 - - - -	householder - - 10 l.
28.	Callan, Michael	3 November - -	householder - - 10 l.
30.	Coyne, Christopher	24 October - -	householder - - 10 l.
31.	Caftan, Lawrence	28 February 1833	freeholder - - 40 s.
32.	Carlan, John	26 - - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
33.	Cusack, Richard	11 July - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
34.	Coots, John	11 - - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
35.	Coots, Thomas	11 - - - -	freeholder - - 40 s.
36.	Crilly, James	23 June - 1834	householder - - 10 l.
37.	Campbell, Nicholas	22 - - 1835	householder - - 10 l.

Appendix (A.)
No. 3.
Persons Registered
as Marksmen.

	Name of Person Registered.	DATE of REGISTRY.	Under what Right Registered.
38.	Condran, Michael	13 July 1835	freeholder - - - 40s.
39.	Connors, William	4 January 1830	householder - - - 10l.
40.	Donegan, Owen	24 October 1832	householder - - - 10l.
41.	Denupsey, John	25 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
42.	Doyle, John	25 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
43.	Daly, Simosa	2 November - -	householder - - - 10l.
44.	Duffy, Patrick	2 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
45.	Dillon, James	25 October - -	householder - - - 10l.
46.	Dennis, Thomas	26 February 1833	freeholder - - - 40s.
47.	Donegan, John	26 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
48.	Drougoid, Thomas	24 June - - -	householder - - - 10l.
49.	Droman, William	11 July - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
50.	Duffy, Simon	11 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
51.	Donnelly, Patrick	13 - - - 1835	freeholder - - - 40s.
52.	Early, Michael	26 October 1832	householder - - - 10l.
53.	Egnew, John	1 November - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
54.	Everard, Loughlin	22 June - 1835	householder - - - 10l.
55.	Farrell, Thomas	25 October 1832	freeholder - - - 40s.
56.	Finegan, John	27 - - - -	householder - - - 10l.
57.	Flood, John	28 February 1833	freeholder - - - 40s.
58.	Flinn, James	28 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
59.	Hogan, Francis	27 October 1832	freeholder - - - 40s.
60.	Hamill, James	2 November - -	householder - - - 10l.
61.	Harlin, James	28 October - -	householder - - - 10l.
62.	Harlin, Patrick	8 November - -	householder - - - 10l.
63.	Hughes, Patrick	1 - - - -	householder - - - 10l.
64.	Heely, John	29 October - -	householder - - - 10l.
65.	Holland, John	1 November - -	householder - - - 10l.
66.	Hutton, Bernard	20 October - -	householder - - - 10l.
67.	Hoey, William	20 February 1833	freeholder - - - 40s.
68.	Jones, Richard	2 November 1832	freeholder - - - 40s.
69.	Johnston, Robert	30 October - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
70.	Kirk, Terence	30 - - - -	householder - - - 10l.
71.	Kirly, Michael	30 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
72.	Keelan, Thomas	2 November - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
73.	Kelly, William	2 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
74.	Kelly, Michael	5 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
75.	Kirwan, Patrick	9 - - - -	householder - - - 10l.
76.	Kirwan, Francis	9 November - -	householder - - - 10l.
77.	Keran, Patrick	30 October - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
78.	Kelly, Lawrence	6 November - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
79.	Keapock, Michael	6 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
80.	Kidd, James	1 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
81.	Kelly, Charles	31 December 1834	householder - - - 10l.
82.	Leonard, Bryan	31 October 1832	freeholder - - - 40s.
83.	Lyons, Patrick	2 November - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
84.	Lee, Terence	31 October - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
85.	Martin, Peter	31 - - - -	householder - - - 10l.
86.	Monaghan, Thomas	6 November - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
87.	M'Knight, Owen	31 October - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
88.	M'Evoy, Thomas	6 November - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
89.	Maypoth, Thomas	1 - - - -	householder - - - 10l.
90.	Moore, Francis	7 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
91.	Martin, Thomas	6 - - - -	householder - - - 10l.
92.	M'Quillen, Nicholas	1 - - - -	householder - - - 10l.
93.	Mulroy, Thomas	6 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
94.	Murkey, John	6 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
95.	Madden, Nicholas	2 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
96.	Marron, Hilary	8 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
97.	Murkey, James	2 - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[53]

	Names of Persons Registered.	DATE of REGISTRY.	Under what Right Registered.
96.	M'Keena, Edward	2 November 1832	freeholder - - - 40s.
97.	M'Cube, Patrick	3 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
100.	Moore, Henry	2 - - - - -	freeman.
101.	M'Callen, James	3 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
102.	M'Nally, Richard	3 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
103.	Markey, Patrick	3 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
104.	M'Callen, Patrick	3 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
105.	M'Quillen, Thomas	3 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
106.	Mathews, Peter	3 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
107.	Moran, Thomas	3 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
108.	Martin, Patrick	3 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
109.	Mathews, Thomas	3 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
110.	M'Evoy, James	3 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
111.	Murphy, John	3 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
112.	Mullen, James	3 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
113.	Malone, Bartholomew	3 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
114.	Mohan, Patrick	5 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
115.	M'Geough, Michael	5 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
116.	M'Nally, Peter	6 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
117.	Manning, Thomas	7 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
118.	Mathews, James	5 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
119.	Moran, Patrick	28 February 1833	freeholder - - - 40s.
120.	Morris, James	26 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
121.	Murphy Philip	28 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
122.	Mulholland, Thomas	26 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
123.	Murray, Thomas	11 July - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
124.	Mathews, Bernard	21 October - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
125.	Mullen, Nicholas	31 December - -	householder - - - 10 l.
126.	Maypothier, Thomas	4 January 1836	householder - - - 10 l.
127.	M'Cue, Philip	5 April - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
128.	Norris, James	7 November 1832	householder - - - 10 l.
129.	O'Brien, Patrick	6 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
130.	O'Neal, Henry	11 July - 1833	freeholder - - - 40s.
131.	O'Neil, Owen	11 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
132.	O'Brien, Henry	23 June - 1834	freeholder - - - 40s.
133.	Phillips, James	11 July - 1833	freeholder - - - 40s.
134.	Quip, Hugh	6 November 1832	householder - - - 10 l.
135.	Reynolds, Philip	9 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
136.	Reilly, Patrick	9 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
137.	Rogers, James	26 February 1833	freeholder - - - 40s.
138.	Rogers, Patrick	26 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
139.	Richardson, John	11 July - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
140.	Reilly, John	24 June - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
141.	Sweeny, James	3 November 1832	freeholder - - - 40s.
142.	Smyth, James	4 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
143.	Skelly, Michael	5 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
144.	Smyth, Michael	5 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
145.	Smyth, Michael	5 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
146.	Skelly, Walter	11 July - 1833	freeholder - - - 40s.
147.	Sweeny, James	21 October - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
148.	Stokes, Nicholas	1 April - 1835	freeholder - - - 40s.
149.	Thompson, John	5 November 1832	freeman.
150.	Timmas, John	5 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
151.	Tierman, Patrick	9 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
152.	Traynor, Edward	7 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
153.	Tuite, James	5 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
154.	Toner, Michael	5 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
155.	Traynor, John	6 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
156.	Toner, Lawrence	6 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
157.	Tierman, Peter	19 October 1835	householder - - - 10 l.
158.	White, Charles	5 November 1832	freeholder - - - 40s.
159.	Walsh, John	8 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
160.	Waters, Thomas	7 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
161.	Woods, James	6 - - - - -	freeholder - - - 40s.
162.	Ward, Patrick	5 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.
163.	Wogan, John	8 - - - - -	householder - - - 10 l.

Appendix (A.)
No. 3.
Persons Registered
as Marksmen.

Drogheda, 15 March 1837.

Jas. Holmes, Clerk of the Peace.

Appendix (A.)

No. 3.
Persons Registered
as Marksmen.

BOROUGH OF DUNDALK.

No.	NAME.	No.	NAME.	No.	NAME.
1	Hugh Byrne.	19	James M'Kay.	37	John M'Govern.
2	John Cullin.	20	James Martin.	38	John Nebbe.
3	Michael Carragher.	21	Daniel Marley.	39	Patrick Neilly.
4	John Cennolly.	22	Patrick M'Ardle.	40	Thomas Nicholson.
5	John Fox.	23	Thomas M'Geone.	41	Luke O'Donnell.
6	James Flinn.	24	John M'Bride.	42	James O'Hare.
7	Owen Haughey.	25	Henry M'Court, sen.	43	Luke O'Donnell.
8	Merit Hays.	26	John Mathews.	44	Patrick Rice.
9	Thomas Hinchey.	27	Patrick Murphy.	45	Thomas Roddy.
10	Daniel Hasevoy.	28	Nicholas Mathews.	46	Patrick Reid.
11	John Huslon.	29	Patrick Murphy.	47	Hugh Rice.
12	Roger Hanlon.	30	John M'Govern.	48	Peter Rice.
13	Denis M'Gee.	31	Edward M'Cormack.	49	Owen Rice.
14	Thomas Malone.	32	Michael M'Donald.	50	Patrick Smith.
15	James Malone.	33	Terence M'Guire.	51	John Taffee.
16	Michael M'Donald.	34	Michael Murphy.	52	Patrick Taffee.
17	Lawrence Mills.	35	William M'Dermott.	53	Owen Woods.
18	Owen M'Ginness.	38	Hugh M'Callogh.		

Thomas Bourne, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF DUNGANNON.

There are only 12 Persons Registered as Voters for this Borough who have signed their Affidavits as Marksmen.

Omagh, 2 March 1837.

Daniel Anchinlock, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF DUNGARVAN.

Freeholders -	-	-	-	-	-	238
Householders -	-	-	-	-	-	61

Waterford, 2 March 1837.

Bat. Delandree, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF ENNIS.

No.	Names of Persons Registered in the Borough of Ennis, who have Subscribed their Affidavits of Registry as Marksmen.	No.	Names of Persons Registered in the Borough of Ennis, who have Subscribed their Affidavits of Registry as Marksmen.
1	Jeremiah Buckley.	7	Lott Meahan.
2	John Carrick.	8	Patrick Collins.
3	Patrick Geraghty.	9	Daniel Brown.
4	Michael Halpin.	10	Patrick Robinson.
5	John Molony.	11	John Clanchy.
6	Thomas Murrige.	12	William Lysaght.

6 March 1837.

William Keon, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF ENNISKILLEN.

James Ball.	Edward Custello.	Thomas Lowry.	High Mersaghan.
James Brennan.	Daniel Cleary.	Thomas Mooney.	James Nolan.
Charles Bland.	Daniel Curry.	Nicholas Mulherin.	Daniel Quinton.
James Carmichael.	Thomas Davis.	Denis Mulherin.	James Tuceoy.
Michael Cullen.	Robert Glenn.	William M'Farland.	John Walsh.
Richard Croke.	William Johnston.		

Adam Nixon, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF KINSALE.

Appendix (A.)

No.	NAME.	RESIDENCE.	OCCUPATION.
1	William O'Brien Adams	Cork-street	esquire.
2	John Anderson	Lower Fisher-street	publican.
3	Garrett Arundell	Market-lane	grocer.
4	John Bohane	Bandon-road	farmer.
5	Patrick Courroy	Mary's Abbey	publican.
6	Timothy Cosser	Cork-street	livery-stable-keeper.
7	Daniel Castles	Barrack-street	victualler.
8	Samuel Denrus	Butcher's-row	ditto.
9	John Falvey	Barrack-street	carrier.
10	James Flynn	Fryer-street	gardener.
11	Daniel Hallahan	Fryer's-walk	publican.
12	Thomas Kelly	Scilly-green	farmer.
13	James Riely	Butcher's-row	tailor.
14	John Mathias Spread	Compass-hill	esquire.
15	Daniel Francis Sullivan	Lower Fisher-street	pawnbroker.
16	Patrick Toomey	The Glen	servant.
17	John Ward	World's-end	publican.

No. 3.
Persons Registered
as Muckmen.

28 February 1837.

James Chatterton, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF LISBURN.

— None. —

S. Darau, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF NEW ROSS.

David Byrne, of Charles-street, tailor.	William Flood, of Tanyard-lane, publican.
John Brown, of Mary-street, hatter.	Laurence Kent, of John-street, dealer.
James Byrne, of Neville-street, farmer.	William Kelly, of Conduit-street.
Thomas Comerford, of South-street, publican.	James Kavanagh, of Irishtown.
John Devereux, of South-street, publican.	Thomas Lawler, of North-street.
John Doyle, of Conduit-street.	Denis Murphy, of Irishtown.
James Froney, of Mary-street, dealer.	James Power, of Irishtown.
William Farrell, of Michael-street, truckster.	

Anthony Hawkins, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF PORTARLINGTON.

Henry Elong.	Michael Coleman.	John Hall.	George M'Daniel.
Peter Copeland.	James Duan.	Bryan Higgins.	Richard Manghen.
James Crosby.	Peter Dunn.	George Kennedy.	Patrick Shaughnessy.
Thomas Connor.	Richard Finlay.	Samuel Melton.	

William Caldwell, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF SLEGO.

Armstrong, James.	Cunningham Peter.	Doyle, Michael.	Gallagher, James.
Anderson, Thomas.	Cunningham, Wm.	Devany, Pat.	Gollagher, Michael.
Begone, Bryan.	Cunningham, Mich.	Davis, James.	Ganly, John.
Bennet, James.	Carty, Connor.	Davy, Peter.	Gillon, Thomas.
Berns, John.	Cawly, James.	Ery, Francis.	Gilgan, James.
Berns, John.	Casly, Denis.	Flynn, Michael.	Gallagher, James.
Bennet, John.	Connor, Charles.	Finegan, Michael.	Gilgan, James.
Black, Michael.	Cleary, Laurence.	Fallon, John.	Gilgan, Edward.
Battle, Owen.	Coanoly, Michael.	Flanely, Murty.	Gollagher, Farrell.
Bres, Denis.	Cryan, Mathew.	Flynn, Edward.	Gilgan, James.
Brennan, Patrick.	Cunlisk, Peter.	Flynn, Peter.	Gallagher, Thomas.
Buchanan, Alex.	Clancy, Roger.	Finan, James.	Healy, Charles.
Brennan, James.	Clancy, Roger.	Finegan, Thomas.	Hart, Peter.
Brennan, Edward.	Carroll, Michael.	Finegan, Michael.	Hart, Roger.
Buns, Roger.	Cunningham, Wm.	Ferguson, John.	Healy, Bryan.
Carter, David.	Carter, David.	Foley, Michael.	Hargadon, Patrick.
Conner, Michael.	Derrig, Connell.	Fury, Jeremiah.	Hargadon, Thomas.
Cawly, Laurence.	Dillon, James.	Gaffay, Thomas.	Hart, Pat.
Conroy, Roger.	Devany, Phelim.	Geary, Martin.	Higgins, Pat.

(continued)

Appendix (A.)

No. 3.
Persons Registered
as Marksmen.

Hart, Owen.	Loughlin, Patrick.	M'Carrick, Pat.	Sweeney, Bryan.
Hargrove, Patrick.	Loughlin, Thomas.	M'Cormack, Lacky.	Scannlon, James.
Jordan, Martin.	Maughin, John.	Neelan, Andrew.	Swoony, James.
Kerr, William.	Morrisroe, Don.	O'Connor, Thomas.	Tucker, Patrick.
Kerrigan, John.	Mullen, John.	O'Donn, Pat.	Tony, Patrick.
Keighron, John.	Mullen, James.	Robinson, John.	Tains, Patrick.
Kilbride, Martin.	M'Cormack, Lacky.	Rader, Hugh.	Tarony, James.
Kinnett, Laurence.	M'Guire, Luke.	Rooney, Patrick.	Ward, Peter.
Kiviaghan, Michael.	M'Coemack, Daniel.	Riley, James.	Waters, James.
Kilfeather, Thomas.	Mullen, William.	Regan, James.	Ward, Mathew.
Kilcullen, Dominick.	M'Guire, Patrick.	Rooney, Pat.	Wall, Thomas.
Kilwee, John.	M'Sharry, Michael.	Sparkey, Patrick.	West, Thomas.
Kerr, Thomas.	Meeawyn, John.	Shannon, Hugh.	Ward, Mathew.
Kilcullen, Thomas.			

R. B. Wynne, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF TRALEE.

Number.	NAMES.	Number.	NAMES.
1	John Ash.	10	William Hayes.
2	John Brosnahan	11	Jeremiah Leane.
3	John Breen.	12	Eusechius M'Gillicuddy.
4	Maurice Begley.	13	John M'Gillicuddy.
5	William Deakery.	14	James Murphy.
6	John Gallivan.	15	Timothy Neill.
7	Thomas Griffin.	16	John O'Flaherty.
8	Thomas Higgins.	17	John Pellican.
9	Timothy Healy.	18	Francis Thomas.

F. Crossie, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF WEXFORD.

John Brown, of the Faith.
Michael M'Daniel, of Abbey-street.

John Kerwan, of Common Quay.
John Redmond, of Ram-street.
Anthony Hawkins, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF YOUGHAL.

Number	NAME.	RESIDENCE.	OCCUPATION.
1	William Ahern	North Main-street	labourer.
2	John Berry	Knockaverry	farmer.
3	Daniel Beckly	North Main-street	shopkeeper.
4	Edmond Bowler	Friar's-street	labourer.
5	William Conway	North Main-street	skinner.
6	John Cosser	South Main-street	shopkeeper.
7	Michael Coleman	North Main-street	tailor.
8	Cornelius Hurley	ditto	victualler.
9	Michael Hallahan	ditto	baker.
10	James Hallahan	West Shamble-lane	shopkeeper.
11	James Kinneary	Copper-alley	farmer.
12	Denis Kenenly	Cross-lane	gardener.
13	Richard Moore	South Main-street	shoemaker.
14	James M'Guire	North Main-street	wheelwright.
15	John M'Guire	Knockaverry	farmer.
16	Darby M'Grath	Windmill-lane	carman.
17	Garrett Meade	North Main-street	victualler.
18	John Murphy	Fish Shamble-lane	dealer.
19	Maurice Nagle	North Main-street	baker.
20	Robert Power	Cock-lane	weaver.
21	John Prendergast, son.	North Main-street	publican.
22	Daniel Quinlan	Nile-street	shoemaker.
23	John Ronnyne	ditto	tailor.
24	Edmond Seward	South Main-street	fisherman.
25	John Sullivan	Mall-lane	tailor.
26	John Frihey	Shambles-lane	publican.

26 February 1837.

James Chatterton, Clerk of the Peace.

Appendix (B.)

— No. 1. —

A RETURN of the Name, Residence and Description of each Person admitted as a FREEMAN in each CORPORATION in Ireland (except Dublin) since March 1831, with the Date of Admission and the Date of Registration of each, together with a Statement of the Right under which each was admitted.

ARNAGH.

There has not been any freemen admitted into the corporation of Armagh since March 1831.

14 February 1837.

Geo. Scott, Registrar.

ATHLONE.

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right under which admitted.
John Armstrong	Kiltown	clerk			
Annemley Streat	Athlone	clerk			
John Streat	ditto	clerk			
John Turkington	ditto	baker			
William Turkington	ditto	baker			
Laurence Borsford	ditto	shoemaker			
William Tiercy	ditto	saddler			
Robert Smith	ditto	shopkeeper			
John Finlay	ditto	pensioner			
William Marshall	ditto	vice-sovereign			
Alexander Graham	ditto	shoemaker			
Richard Joyce	ditto	merchant			
William Joyce, jun.	ditto	gentleman			
Geo. Rodney Mathews	ditto	cabinet-maker			
Geo. Richard Mathews	ditto	apothecary			
John Butler	ditto	gentleman			
Timothy Richard James	ditto	esquire			
James James	ditto	esquire			
William James	ditto	esquire			
Patrick Hanly	ditto	esquire			
James Kelly	ditto	esquire			
Walter Kelly	ditto	esquire			
Richard Daly	ditto	esquire, barrister	14 June 1831	- - did not register as a freeman.	honorary.
William Ramsey	Berwick	farmer			
Joseph Bigley	Cannagh	farmer			
John Daly	Boileswell	gentleman			
Robert Bigley	Cannagh	publican			
Thomas Nugent	Thorn Hill	esquire			
Leonard Haddon	Haddon's Bay	esquire			
Gerald Dillon	Summer Hill	esquire			
Henry Wm. Sproule	Athlone	gentleman			
Andrew Sproule	ditto	ditto			
John Hillyard, sen.	ditto	cutler			
John English	ditto	carpenter			
John Hillyard, jun.	ditto	cutler			
William Hillyard	ditto	ditto			
Thomas Hillyard	ditto	ditto			
James Luby	ditto	clerk			
John Somwell	ditto	esquire			
James Sproule, jun.	ditto	esquire			
John Mathews	ditto	gentleman			
Charles Dillon	ditto	ditto			
John Lucas	ditto	pensioner			
Stephen Keely	ditto	ditto			
Arthur Hamilton	ditto	ditto			

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right only which admits.
George Hamilton	Athlone	copper			
John Johnston	Lisbawn	milker			
William Peel	Athlone	penitoner			
Robert Charters	ditto	esquire			
James Ash	ditto	penitoner			
Richard G. Holden	ditto	master			
Arthur Gaety	ditto	ditto			
Dr. William Nelson	ditto	esquire			
Dr. Terence Henry	ditto	esquire			
Edward Dawson	ditto	surgeon			
Enos Magrath	ditto	esquire			
Andrew Hopkins	ditto	shoemaker			
William Hopkins	ditto	ditto			
Richard Duggan	ditto	ditto			
Abraham Lynch	ditto	weaver			
Richard Salisbury, sen.	ditto	ditto			
Richard Salisbury, jun.	ditto	ditto			
Samuel Salisbury	ditto	ditto			
James Salisbury	ditto	ditto			
Anthony Richardson	ditto	superannuated gauger.			
Robert Stanley	ditto	gentleman			
Thomas Birchall	ditto	nailee			
Peter Birchall	ditto	ditto			
Richard Handcock	ditto	esquire			
Robert J. Handcock	ditto	esquire			
James Robert Moffet	ditto	esquire			
William Healy	Bridewell	weaver			
John R. W. Larkin	Athlone	gentleman			
Alexander Healy	Knockina	farmer			
Thomas Smith	ditto	ditto			
John Wilson	ditto	ditto			
Robert Ginhans	ditto	ditto			
John Graham	ditto	ditto			
C. Adams, jun	Clonbonny	esquire			
William Longworth	Kilnasco	farmer	24 June 1831	- - did not register as a freeman.	honorary.
Thomas Johnston	Beick Island	ditto			
Robert Johnston	ditto	weaver			
John Johnston	ditto	ditto			
William Bruce	Auburne	gentleman			
Robert Mathews	Killare	esquire			
Hugh Fitzgerald	Fochane	clerk			
St. George Gray	- - - Waldenstown Lodge.	esquire			
Edward Kilduff	Cornemaddy	farmer			
John Keefe	ditto	ditto			
Mathew Craig	ditto	ditto			
Mathew Craig	Cornemagh	ditto			
George Sproule	Larkfield	gentleman			
Henry Sproule	ditto	ditto			
Charles Wm. Sproule	ditto	ditto			
William French	Clonsnequin	esquire			
William Magill	Littleton Lodge	esquire			
Godfrey Mitchell	Athlone	gentleman			
William Johnston, sen.	Clonsnequin	esquire			
John Grier	Moate	farmer			
Alexander Martin	Moate	apothecary			
William Pencock	Mount Temple	clerk			
William Batterby	Drummay	clerk			
Thomas Walsh	White Hall	clerk			
William Mitchell	Shannon Bridge	esquire			
Thomas Robinson	Athlone	merchant			
Henry Gilligan	Caprakelly	farmer			
Richard W. Bond	Carranure	esquire			
Robert Judge	Athlone	parish clerk			
William McLean	ditto	shoemaker			
George Bland, sen.	ditto	painter			
Jeremiah Bland	ditto	ditto			
John Siggins	ditto	gentleman			
Isaac Cornelius	ditto	town-clerk.			

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right under which admitted.
William Cornelius	Athlone	painter	24 June 1831	- - did not register as a freeman.	honorary.
Aaron Baker	Bonevalley	weaver			
Arthur Baker	ditto	ditto			
Robert Dudley	Athlone	pensioner			
George Lennon	ditto	shopkeeper			
Thomas Brunker	ditto	maason			
Thomas Brunker, jun.	ditto	ditto			
Henry Brunker	ditto	ditto			
Robert English, sen.	ditto	shopkeeper			
Robert English, jun.	ditto	ditto			
Thomas English	ditto	carpenter			
William English	ditto	timber merchant			
George Craig	Conemagh	farmer			
Thomas Craig	ditto	ditto			
John Dillon	Gardiner-street, Dublin.	esquire			
Robert J. E. Mooney	Doon Castle	ditto			
Francis Mooney	ditto	ditto			
F. Longworth, jun.	Glynn	ditto			
John Longworth	ditto	ditto			
Major W. Cuppsidge	Athlone	half-pay			
George Cuppsidge	Galway	esquire			
John L. Cuppsidge	East Hill	esquire			
R. Cuppsidge, jun.	ditto	ditto			
W. Cuppsidge, jun.	ditto	ditto			
James F. Cuppsidge	ditto	ditto			
G. Cuppsidge, jun.	ditto	ditto			
Mathias Cuppsidge	ditto	ditto			
Henry O. Cuppsidge	ditto	ditto			
John Caulfield	Retreat	ditto			
Thomas Caulfield	Benown	clerk			
Edmund Robinson	Bullockfield	farmer			
Robert Harris	Birr	clerk			
Robert Harris	Cloughjordan	ditto			
Thomas F. Valacka	Reclifort	esquire			
John Hudson, jun.	Teyfield	ditto			
James Langstaff	Langfield	ditto			
Charles Linn	Raylin	farmer			
Henry Malone	Lisivohn	esquire			
Robert H. Temple	Waterstown	ditto			
Gasparus H. Temple	Killenaro	ditto			
John Potts, jun.	St. Mark's	ditto			
William Potts, jun.	ditto	ditto			
Joseph Potts	ditto	ditto			
Edward Maxwell	Glasson	ditto			
Laurel Burns	Moate	ditto			
Richard W. Bagley	Athlone	ditto			
John Johnston	Conemaddy	farmer			
William Leard	Raylin	ditto			
Edward M. Hodson	Rock Hill	esquire			
Seppontus Stretton	Athlone	lieutenant-colonel			
Christopher Hamilton	Killbrken	ditto			
William Leox Napier	Littleton	esquire			
John Mathews	Moate	surgeon	25 June 1832	- ditto -	- ditto.
Christopher Mathews	Killare	esquire	- ditto -	- ditto -	- ditto.
Richard Joyce	Athlone	merchant	24 June 1833	- ditto -	- in right of birth, being son to a freeman.
William Joyce, jun.	ditto	gentleman	- ditto -	- ditto -	- ditto.

Certified to be a true Return,

Jesse Cornelius,
Deputy Recorder and Town Clerk.

BANDON BRIDGE.

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right under which admitted.
St. J. A. Clerke	Overton	lieut. colonel	4 Nov. 1831	-	By resolution of court of D'Oyer hundred.
George Dowden	Bandon	esquire	-	25 July 1833	
George Cornwall	Woodlands	esquire	-	-	
William Seely	Woodview	esquire	-	-	
Richard Seely	Richmont	esquire	-	-	
Benjamin Hill Gillman	Bandon	esquire	-	-	
Thomas Bennis	Hatchill	esquire	-	-	
R. Smithson Wheeler	Bandon	apothecary	-	-	
Henry Beteher	Bandon	apothecary	-	-	
Richard Trestlan	Bandon	wine merchant	-	25 July 1833	
Jeremiah Biggs	Bandon	gentleman	-	25 July 1833	
Henry Cole Bowen	Bandon	esquire	-	-	
Thomas Whitmore	Apley Park	esquire	20 Sept. 1833	-	
William Comer	Mishells	esquire	25 July 1833	-	Birthright, as eldest son of a freeman.
Jos. Thos. Wheeler	Bandon	esquire	-	30 Sept. 1833	
Edward Gillman	Rockhouse	esquire	-	-	
Rev. Allyn Evanson	-	-	-	-	
John Bennis, jun.	Cashmore	esquire	-	-	
William Bennett	Bandon	gentleman	-	-	
John Cotter	Bandon	gentleman	-	3 Feb. 1834	
George Pope	Bandon	gentleman	-	-	
Francis Lovell	Bandon	gentleman	-	-	
Hon. Chas. B. Bernard	Castle Bernard	-	5 Sept. 1833	28 Feb. 1837	
Hon. Hen. B. Bernard	Castle Bernard	-	-	-	By resolution of court of D'Oyer hundred.
Richard Dowden	Bandon	esquire	-	-	
Thomas Craun	Bandon	esq., barrist. at-law	30 Sept. 1833	-	
Samuel Vignolles	Bandon	-- esq., chief magistrate police preservation force.	3 Feb. 1834	-	By resolution of court of D'Oyer hundred.
Wm. Conner Sullivan	Bandon	merchant	-	3 Feb. 1834	
Thomas Wheeler	Bandon	captain 28th foot	-	-	
James Holt	Bandon	pensioner	-	3 Feb. 1834	

1 March 1837.

Edward Doherty, Town Clerk.

BELFAST.

There have not been any freemen admitted into the corporation since March 1831.

24 February 1837.

John Agnew, Sovereign.

CARLOW.

1. Henry Butler	Carlow	esquire	24 June 1831	N.B.—The freemen are not registered in the corporation of Carlow.	Sons of freemen.
2. Joseph Fishbourne	ditto	ditto	ditto		
3. W. Fishbourne, jun.	ditto	ditto	29 Sept. 1839		
4. Wm. F. Burton	Burton Hall	ditto	29 Sept. 1835		
5. Wm. Duckett	Russellstown Park	ditto	ditto		
6. Wm. Fishbourne	Hollymead	ditto	ditto		
7. John Alexander, jun.	Milford	ditto	ditto		
8. Samuel Elliott	Kilmeany	ditto	ditto		
9. Wm. Cope Cooper	Cooper's Hill	ditto	9 Nov. 1835		

R. Clayton Brown, Sovereign.

CLONMEL.

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right under which admitted.			
John Bagwell	Marefield	esquire	11 May 1832	- - Clerk of the peace for the county will give this information. It is not within the power of the mayor or town-clerk.	In right of birth.			
Thomas Luther	Clonmel	esquire						
Peter R. Banfield	Clonmel	esquire						
Stephen Moore	Barn	esquire						
Edward Kellett	Clonbody	esquire						
William Quinn	Lalohar	esquire						
William Perry	Woodroffe	esquire						
John Bagwell	Glenconner	esquire						
Thomas Ryan	Cottage	esquire						
Thomas Binsley	Marefield	clerk						
Richard Moore	Sammorhill	esquire						
John Gordon	Clonmel	esquire						
Samuel O'way	Clonmel	merchant				28 Dec. 1832	- ditto -	- - ditto.
Benjamin Grubb	Clonmel	merchant						
Thomas Chaytor	Clonmel	gentleman						
Wm. H. Riall	Annerville	esquire						
Pinas Biall	Haysood	esquire						
William Harvey	Colville	gentleman						
Joseph Malcomson	Clonmel	merchant						
Joseph Jacob	Clonmel	merchant						
Joseph Edmundson	Clonmel	clerk						
Henry Jacob	Clonmel	merchant						
John Hughes	Clonmel	merchant						
Edward Pennefather	Darlinghill	esquire						
James P. Rhoades	Clonmel	clerk	29 Mar. 1833	- ditto -	By grace especial.			
Richard Burgess	Clonmel	surgeon						
Robert Davis	Clonmel	gentleman						
Stephen C. Moore, jun.	Barn	esquire						
William Quinn, jun.	Lalohar	esquire						
Hil Harvey, jun.	Ballybeg	gentleman						
James Castell	Clonmel	gentleman						
John Farrell	Park	farmer						
Rev. Robert Bell	Clonmel	Dr. Divinity						
Abbot Teyser	Clonmel	gentleman						
Thomas Murray	Clonmel	merchant						
William Bell	Clonmel	Dr. Medicine						
Arthur Ardagh	Clonmel	merchant						
William Smith	Clonmel	merchant	- ditto -	- ditto -	In right of marriage.			
William Duckett	Clonmel	esquire						
Rich. M. Duckett	Clonmel	esquire						
John W. Dowley	Clonmel	Dr. Medicine						
George Lane	Clonmel	esquire						
John H. Clibborn	Annerville	merchant						
Mary Edward Scoble	Clonmel	surgeon						
Julian Malcomson	Clonmel	merchant						
John Malcomson	Clonmel	merchant						
Robert Malcomson	Clonmel	merchant						
William Stringman	Clonmel	merchant						
Robert Stringman	Clonmel	merchant						
Joseph Chaytor	Rathconan	esquire						
Wm. Edmundson, jun.	Clonmel	gentleman	- ditto -	- ditto -	In right of service.			
William Davis	Clonmel	gentleman						
Rob. F. G. Howell	Clonmel	gentleman						
John Grubb	Clonmel	gentleman						
John Going	Clonmel	shopkeeper						
James Going	Clonmel	gentleman						
Andrew Going	Clonmel	gentleman						
Edward Jaess	Clonmel	merchant						
John Harvey	Clonmel	gentleman						
Thomas Murphy	Clonmel	merchant						
Charles Ashton	Clonmel	merchant						
Edward Power	Clonmel	merchant						
John Shaw	Clonmel	merchant						
James Burke	Clonmel	merchant						
Rev. Robert Bell	Clonmel	clerk						
Burley Clibborn	Clonmel	merchant	6 April 1833	- ditto -	In right of birth.			
Abbot Trayer, jun.	Clonmel	gentleman						
Samuel Davis	Clonmel	merchant						
Edward Sargent	Clonmel	merchant						
Stephen Longman	Clonmel	merchant						
James R. Smith	Clonmel	attorney						
Rich. P. Vowell	Clonmel	esquire						
Wm. Ardagh	Clonmel	solicitor						
Joseph Going	Clonmel	gentleman						
Joseph Keury	Clonmel	gentleman						
Samuel Riall	Clonmel	solicitor						
	Annerville	solicitor				30 Mar. 1825	- ditto -	- ditto -

Edw. Lebarts, Town Clerk.

C O R K.

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right under which admitted.
Massy Hutchinson Missy.	Mount Massey, co. Cork.	esquire	6 May 1831	not registered	birthright.
Edward Tottenham	city Cork	gentleman	" "	29 Oct. 1831	same.
Rev. John Tottenham	Nathangan, co. Kildare.	clerk	" "	not "	same.
Sir Charles Cuyler	" "	col. 6th reg. foot	6 June 1831	not "	favour.
Adm. Sir E. Codrington	" "	" "	26 Sep. 1831	not "	favour.
Lieut. R. C. Mousell	" "	" "	26 Oct. 1831	not "	favour.
John Purcell	city Dublin	gentleman	" "	not "	birthright.
George Newson	city Cork	gentleman	" "	10 Nov. 1831	same.
Right Rev. Sam. Kyle, Lord Bishop of Cork and Ross.	city Cork	" "	8 Feb. 1831	not "	favour.
T. Somerville Parker	Passage, co. Cork	esquire	" "	not "	birthright.
William White	city Cork	esquire	11 April 1831	9 Nov. 1831	same.
John Quarry, s.n.	city Cork	gentleman	" "	23 Oct. 1831	same.
Thomas Segars	city Cork	clauder	" "	27 Nov. 1831	servitude.
Richard Gerde	city Cork	esquire	13 June 1831	19 Oct. 1831	birthright.
John Cooke	city Cork	victualler	" "	25 Oct. 1831	servitude.
Francis Woodley	city Cork	wine-merchant	" "	13 Nov. 1831	same.
William Going	Attaville, co. Tipperary.	esquire	30 June 1831	not "	birthright.
William Cooke	city Cork	" "	25 July 1831	9 Nov. 1831	same.
William Spensing	city Cork	cooper	" "	3 April 1835	servitude.
Henry V. Hayes	city Cork	esquire	" "	not "	birthright.
James Morrough	city Cork	esquire	22 Aug. 1831	10 Nov. 1831	same.
John Bagwell	Marfield, co. Tipperary.	esquire	" "	not "	same.
Thomas Eastham	city Cork	esquire	3 Sept. 1831	3 Nov. 1831	same.
Henry Westrop	" "	esquire	" "	24 Nov. 1831	same.
John Coppinger	city Cork	esquire, s.n.	" "	23 Oct. 1831	same.
G. W. Walter Roche	city Cork	gentleman	" "	20 Oct. 1831	same.
George Fendall	city Cork	shipwright	" "	not "	servitude.
T. Patrickson Kemp	city Cork	printer	" "	27 Nov. 1831	same.
John McCarthy	city Cork	housesmith	" "	not "	same.
William Beattie	city Cork	carrier	" "	16 Oct. 1831	same.
Robert McCarty	Carignanvar, co. Cork.	esquire	10 Sep. 1831	23 Nov. 1831	birthright.
John Harvey	city Cork	merchant	" "	15 Nov. 1831	servitude.
W. Augustus Besoufort	Glennire, co. Cork	esquire	" "	13 Nov. 1831	birthright.
Robert Hall	city Cork	merchant	" "	23 Sep. 1831	same.
John Armstrong	city Cork	cooper	" "	13 Nov. 1831	servitude.
F. Carlton Reeves	city Cork	esquire	13 Sep. 1831	5 Nov. 1831	birthright.
James Milner Barry	city Cork	gentleman	" "	12 Oct. 1831	same.
John Beattie	city Cork	carrier	" "	27 Nov. 1831	servitude.
Richard Dandon	city Cork	shipwright	" "	not "	same.
Benjamin Turner, jun.	city Cork	cooper	17 Sep. 1831	26 Sep. 1835	same.
Cornelius Cagilan	city Cork	shipwright	" "	not "	same.
William Malose	city Cork	gentleman	" "	not "	birthright.
W. Crosbie Harrington	city Cork	gentleman	" "	not "	same.
Francis Paoli Drew	city Cork	apothecary	" "	23 Nov. 1831	servitude.
Richard Wood	city Cork	" "	" "	3 April 1835	same.
Pierce Purcell	Castlewick, co. Cork	esquire	18 Sep. 1831	6 Nov. 1831	birthright.
John Corven	city Cork	stationer and printer	19 Sep. 1831	13 Nov. 1831	servitude.
W. Bishop Darman	Kinsale, co. Cork	gentleman	14 Nov. 1831	15 Nov. 1831	birthright.
William Galsby	Ballee, co. Cork	gentleman	24 Nov. 1831	26 Nov. 1831	same.
Charles Purcell	same	gentleman	" "	24 Nov. 1831	same.
John Martin	Killehora, co. Cork	esquire	" "	24 Nov. 1831	same.
Joseph Barter Wake- ham.	Spring Hill, co. Cork.	esquire	" "	24 Nov. 1831	same.
Henry Harding	Harding Grove, co. Cork.	esquire	23 Nov. 1831	26 Nov. 1831	same.
Abraham Norris	Dunkettle, co. Cork	esquire	" "	not "	same, reg. as 501. 8th!
Isaac Stephen Varian	city Cork	shopkeeper	14 Feb. 1833	not "	same.
Thomas Biggs Lane	city Cork	merchant	25 July 1833	23 Sep. 1835	servitude.
Maj.-Gen. Sir Thomas Arbutnot.	" "	" "	30 July 1833	not "	favour.
James Morrough	city Cork	esquire	20 Sep. 1833	9 Nov. 1831	birthright.
George Fair	city Cork	cooper	27 Sep. 1833	3 April 1835	servitude.
Col. W. Warne	" "	" "	" "	not "	favour.
Charles Corkran	" "	esq., capt. 8th reg. ft.	" "	not "	same.
Lieut.-Col. C. King	" "	" "	" "	not "	same.
Thomas Geary	city Cork	cabinet-maker	5 April 1834	3 April 1835	servitude.
Godfrey T. Baker	Fortwilliam li- berties, city Cork	esquire	5 May 1834	not "	birthright, reg. as 501. freeholder.

C O R K—continued.

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right under which admitted.
Robert Clarke	city Cork	tallow-chandler	5 May 1834	not	servitude, reg. as a hold
Maj. Lord C. Wellesley			22 Sep. 1834	not	favour,
Geo. Henry Wise	city Cork	esquire		4 April 1835	birthright.
C. Henry Woodroffe	city Cork	gentleman	27 Jan. 1835	25 Sep. 1835	same.
Joseph Spearings, jun.	city Cork	gentleman		3 April 1835	same.
Samson Jarvis		esquire		not	same.
Joseph Haxton	city Cork	gentleman		3 April 1835	same.
Samphrey Hailes, jun.	city Cork	apothecary		3 April 1835	servitude.
John L. Reeves	city Cork	printer		5 Jan. 1837	same.
J. Sheffield Hailes	city Cork	apothecary		3 April 1835	same.
John Wilkinson	city Cork	builder		3 April 1835	same.
William Taylor	city Cork	timber-merchant		3 April 1835	same.
Denis McCarthy Stubbs		lieut. 63rd reg. R.	9 Mar. 1835	4 April 1835	birthright.
Benjamin T. Boster		gentleman		not	same.
Robert Butcher	city Cork	gentleman		3 April 1835	same.
John Tolson	city Cork	gentleman		24 Sep. 1835	same.
John Keyburn	city Cork	chandler		5 April 1835	same.
Leah Hackett Bolster	city Cork	bookseller and stationer.		3 April 1835	servitude.
Thomas Barrow	city Cork	merchant		3 April 1835	same.
John Ladd	city Cork	merchant		23 Sep. 1835	same.
John Callaghan	city Cork	baker		not	same.
John Thornhill	city Cork	gentleman		not	birthright.
William Chotras	city Cork	merchant		3 April 1835	servitude.
John Newson	city Cork	gentleman		3 April 1835	birthright.
Robt. Bisset Lawson	city Cork	hosier		22 June 1835	servitude.
Daniel Lane Sandford	city Cork	merchant		3 April 1835	same.
William Martin	city Cork	printer		3 April 1835	same.
William Walsh	city Cork	victualer		4 April 1835	same.
William Lane	city Cork	cooper		not	birthright.
Phineas Goode	city Cork	silversmith		3 April 1835	servitude.
Robert Christian Carr	city Cork	esquire		3 April 1835	birthright.
Anthony Fitzgerald	city Cork	cooper		3 April 1835	servitude.
John Welsh	city Cork	attorney	23 May 1835	not	birthright.
George Jones	city Cork	gentleman		22 June 1835	same.
James Shaw Willes	city Cork	gentleman		22 June 1835	same.
John Herbert Orpen	city Cork	physician & surg ⁿ		22 June 1835	same.
George Young	city Cork	cabinet-maker		22 June 1835	servitude.
John Bayne	city Cork	architect	19 June 1835	5 Nov. 1835	same.
John Lloyd	city Cork	apothecary		23 Sep. 1835	same.
George Seymour	city Cork	hardware-merch ^t		24 Sep. 1835	same.
Abraham Steers	city Cork	turner		22 June 1835	same.
John Paul	city Cork	gentleman		24 Sep. 1835	birthright.
Enoch S. Webber	city Cork	gentleman		22 June 1835	same.
Thomas Meyers	city Cork	merchant		1 Jan. 1836	servitude.
His Excellency Henry Constance, Earl of Mulgrave.		Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.	8 Aug. 1835	not	favour.
Robert Hall	city Cork	merchant	18 Sep. 1835	23 Sep. 1835	birthright.
John King	city Cork	engineer		26 Sep. 1835	servitude.
Cha. Thomas Lefebure	city Cork	gentleman		23 Sep. 1835	same.
John Lawrence Forrest	city Cork	gentleman		22 Sep. 1835	birthright.
Richard Gibbins		gentleman		not	same.
Henry Tiry	city Cork	cooper		20 Sep. 1835	servitude.
George Atkins, jun.	city Cork	merchant		not	same.
Henry Hall	city Cork	cooper		25 Sep. 1835	same.
Thomas Keating	city Cork	housesmith		not	same.
James Geo. Oulshott	city Cork	apothecary		22 Sep. 1836	same.
Michael Browne	city Cork	hatter	24 Sep. 1835	not	same.
James Barry	city Cork	gunmaker	31 Dec. 1835	1 Jan. 1836	same.
John Goris	city Cork	cooper		1 April 1836	same.
John Heard	city Cork	clother		1 Jan. 1836	birthright.
Srv. S. Meese Kyle	city Cork	scholar ^s of Cork		not	same, reg. as a genl. child
Isaac Writton Jones	city Cork	gentleman		not	same.
Abraham Haynes	city Cork	gentleman		not	same.
James Keane	city Cork	gentleman		not	birthright.
William Large	city Cork	surgeon		7 Nov. 1836	servitude.
John Thomas Ellis	city Cork	gentleman	18 Jan. 1836	not	birthright.
John Wesley Austin	city Cork	printer		1 April 1836	servitude.
Thomas Hooford	city Cork	gentleman	25 Jan. 1836	1 April 1836	birthright.
Thomas Kift	city Cork	gentleman	28 Mar. 1836	not	same.
Henry Dillon Croker	city Cork	gentleman		1 April 1836	same.
John Guthbert	city Cork	ship-carpenter		not	servitude.
Geo. John Hodder	city Cork	gentleman		1 April 1836	birthright.

C O R K — continued.

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right only which admitted.
Anthony Perrier, jun.	city Cork	merchant	15 Apr. 1836	20 June 1836	servitude.
Richard Lovers	city Cork	chandler	5 July 1836	7 Nov. 1836	same.
Henry Seymour	city Cork	brausefounder	- - -	22 Sept. 1836	same.
James Morgan	city Cork	mailor	- - -	21 Sept. 1836	same.
Thomas Gregg	city Cork	gentleman	8 Aug. 1836	- - -	birthright.
John Taylor	city Cork	grocer	- - -	1 Nov. 1836	servitude.
Nicholas Curmains	city Cork	esquire	13 Sept. 1836	- - -	birthright.
William Amos Cooke	city Cork	gentleman	- - -	21 Sept. 1836	same.
George James Wise	city Cork	gentleman	- - -	1 Nov. 1836	same.
Wm. Storke Chamber	city Cork	cooper	- - -	- - -	servitude.
Thomas Henry Goris	city Cork	cooper	- - -	- - -	same.
Francis Davis	city Cork	ship-carpenter	- - -	21 Sept. 1836	same.
Ralph Michael Buxtood Westropp	city Cork	esquire	7 Dec. 1836	not - -	birthright.
Emanuel Berj. Boss	city Cork	gentleman	- - -	2 Jan. 1837	same.
John Francis Maguire	city Cork	linendraper	- - -	- - -	servitude.
William M'Namara	city Cork	printer	- - -	- - -	same.
William Sullivan	city Cork	printer	13 Dec. 1836	- - -	same.

DROGHEDA.

William Gerrard	-- Lisacran, co. Meath.	-- son of Thomas Gerrard, esq.	15 Apr. 1831	not registered	special favour.
George Graine	Drogheda	-- fourth son of Jas. Greene, M. D.	- - -	not registered	birth.
John Woodroffe	city of Dublin	gentleman	- - -	not registered	birth.
Rev. John Jebb	city of Dublin	-- clerk, eldest son of Judge Jebb.	15 July 1831	-- registered as a 50l. freeholder, 25th June 1836	birth.
Richard Jebb	city of Dublin	-- barrister, second son of Judge Jebb.	- - -	not registered	birth.
Robert Jebb	city of Dublin	-- barrister, third son of Judge Jebb.	- - -	not registered	birth.
Robert Crovan Wade	-- Clonsbrany, county Meath.	-- esq., son of W. Blaney Wade, esq.	- - -	not registered	birth.
John Wade	-- Clonsbrany, county Meath.	-- esq., son of W. Blaney Wade, esq.	- - -	not registered	birth.
William Dawson, jun.	Drogheda	shotmaker	- - -	25 Oct. 1832	service.
John Eccleston	town of Drogheda	gentleman	- - -	not registered	birth.
Rev. John Magee	Drogheda	-- clerk, vicar of St. Peter's, Drogheda.	7 Oct. 1831	-- registered as a 50l. freeholder 1 Nov. 1832.	special favour.
Rowley Hyland	city of Dublin	esquire	- - -	not registered	special favour.
John Kelly	town of Drogheda	carpenter	- - -	5 Nov. 1836	birth.
William Lyons	city of Dublin	painter	- - -	not registered	service.
John Coste Barnes	-- Newtown, co. Meath.	-- esq., son of Caleb Barnes, Newtown, county Meath.	- - -	not registered	birth.
John Apperson, jun.	-- Bally Hoe, co. Meath.	-- son of John Apperson, Bally Hoe, county Meath.	- - -	not registered	birth.
James Eccleston, jun.	-- town of Drogheda.	-- son of James Eccleston, late of the town of Drogheda.	- - -	not registered	birth.
John Bridges	-- town of Drogheda.	-- son of Thomas Bridges, of the town of Drogheda.	- - -	not registered	birth.
Har. Lambert Brabazon	-- Seafield, co. Louth.	-- son of Harry Brabazon, esq.	- - -	not registered	birth.
Francis Fairtlough	Drogheda	-- esq., Lieut. 16th foot, son of Francis Graham Fairtlough, esq.	- - -	26 Oct. 1832	birth.
Rev. Wm. Hen. Foster	-- Collon, co. Louth.	-- clerk, son of the late most Rev. Dr. Foster.	- - -	3 Nov. 1832	birth.

DROGHEDA.—continued.

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right under which admitted.
Thomas Collins -	Drogheda -	-- gentleman, son of Thomas Collins, deceased.	7 Oct. 1831	23 Oct. 1832	birth.
Wm. Barlow Smyth -	-- Barbaravilla, co. Westmeath.	-- esq., eldest son of the late Ralph Smyth, esq., esquire -	- - -	not registered	birth.
James Brabazon -	-- Mornington, county Meath.	- - -	13 Jan. 1832	not registered	special favour.
Robert Jebb -	city of Dublin -	-- esq., fourth son of Judge Jebb.	4 May 1832	not registered	birth.
George F. Blackburne	-- Mornington-house, co. Meath.	esquire -	13 July 1832	not registered	special favour.
Rev. C. Boyton -	-- Trinity College, Dublin.	- - - clerk, fellow of Trinity College, Dublin.	- - -	not registered	special favour.
Patrick Darbey -	-- town of Drogheda.	surgeon -	11 Oct. 1833	- registered as a 10 l. householder 24 October 1832.	special favour.
Frederick Geo. Greene	Drogheda -	-- fourth son of the late James Greene, of Drogheda, M. D., deceased.	10 Oct. 1834	1 Apr. 1835	birth.
Wallop Brabazon -	-- Termonfeckin, county Louth.	-- second son of Wallop Brabazon, of Rath, co. Louth, esq., deceased.	16 Jan. 1835	11 Oct. 1836	birth.
William Henry Collins	Drogheda -	-- fifth son of Thos. Collins, late of the town of Drogheda, attorney, deceased.	- - -	not registered	birth.
James Charles Collins	Drogheda -	-- fourth son of said Thomas Collins, attorney, deceased.	- - -	22 June 1835	birth.
Hon. St. George Smith	-- Greenhills, co. Louth.	esquire -	- - -	1 Apr. 1835	birth.
Esyle Simpson -	-- Ardagh, co. Louth.	gentleman -	- - -	- - -	birth.
Charles William Evans	Drogheda -	gentleman -	- - -	- - -	birth.
Wakefield Hamilton	Drogheda -	printer -	- - -	22 June 1835	birth.
Peter Allen -	Drogheda -	gentleman -	- - -	not registered	birth.
John Edw. Appleyard	Drogheda -	gentleman -	- - -	1 Apr. 1835	birth.
William Rogers -	- Killystown, co. Meath.	gentleman -	- - -	not registered	birth.
William Henry Shegog	Drogheda -	gentleman -	- - -	not registered	birth.
Wm. Oliver Fairclough	Drogheda -	gentleman -	- - -	4 Jan. 1836	birth.
Fréd. G. Jos. Leland	Drogheda -	gentleman -	- - -	1 Apr. 1835	birth.
George Clark -	Drogheda -	saddler -	- - -	- - -	marriage.
John Shaw -	Drogheda -	schoolmaster	- - -	- - -	marriage.
William Roy -	-- Yellow Butte, co. town, Drogheda.	farmer -	- - -	- - -	marriage.
James Leech -	-- Collon, county Louth.	bleacher and sapper	- - -	- - -	service.
The Hon. Randall E. Plunkett.	- Dunacree Castle, co. Meath.	M. P. -	13 Feb. 1835	not registered	special favour.
John Foster Robinson	Drogheda -	-- son of Walter Robinson.	1 May 1835	22 June 1835	birth.
James Jeffes -	-- Fair-street, town of Drogheda.	gentleman -	17 July 1835	- not registered as a freeman, but registered as a householder, 25 June 1836.	marriage.
St. John Collins	Drogheda -	-- fifth son of Thos. Collins, deceased.	7 Aug. 1835	19 Oct. 1835	birth.
Thomas Apperem	Drogheda -	printer -	- - -	5 Apr. 1836	birth.
George Barrall -	Drogheda -	son of Alex. Barrall	- - -	- - -	birth.
Stephen Henry Smith	-- Annesbrook, county Meath.	-- third son of Hen. Smith, of the same place, esq.	9 Oct. 1835	not registered	birth.
Ralph Smith, jun.	-- Greenhills, co. Louth.	-- second son of A.M. St. Geo. Smith of the same place.	- - -	5 Apr. 1836	birth.

DROGHEDA—continued.

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right under which admitted.
Saint George Smith	- - Anneshbrook, county Meath.	- fourth son of Hen. Smith, of the same place, esq.	9 Oct. 1835	not registered	birth.
Henry Osborne	- - Davidstown Castle, co. Meath.	esquire	15 Jan. 1836	5 Apr. 1836	marriage.
Thomas Brodigan	- - Piltown, co. Meath.	esquire	7 Oct. 1836	- - not registered as freeman; but registered as a 20l. freeholder 10 Oct. 1832.	special favour.

23 Feb. 1837.

Robert Festland, Mayor.

DUNDALK.

Samuel Canker	- Dowdall's hill	- M. D. esq.	29 Sept. 1832	- - -	- - by petition, on account of birthright.
Thomas Coulter	- Newtown	- gentleman	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
Arthur Coulter	- Dowdall's hill	- farmer	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
Samuel Coulter	- Dundalk	- gentleman	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
Robert Coulter	- ditto	- ditto	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
Edward Tipping	- Bellurgan park	- esquire	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
James Tipping	- Lisnavilly	- esquire	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
Hamilton Skelton	- Jonesborough	- esquire	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
William Skelton	- Villa	- farmer	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
Philip Skelton	- ditto	- civil engineer	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
Joseph Elms	- Merchon, Dundalk	- farmer	- ditto	- - -	- ditto.
Henry Maxwell	- Dundalk	- esquire	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
Thomas Crilly	- ditto	- labourer	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
John Cully	- ditto	- servant	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
Samuel Reid	- ditto	- farmer	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
George L. Bigger	- ditto	- gentleman	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
Samuel Harrison	- ditto	- dealer	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
Tobias John Purcell	- ditto	- attorney	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
Percy N. Bigger	- ditto	- merchant	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
Turner Barrett	- Dowdall's hill	- farmer	- - -	- - -	- ditto.
George Skelton	- Dundalk	- merchant	29 June 1833	- - -	- - presented with the freedom as a respectable inhabitant of the town.
Honourable Augustus Jocelyn	- - -	- lieut. 6th Carbiniers	30 Sept. -	- - -	- - by petition, on account of birthright.

None of the parties here named have registered any vote for the borough as freeman.

24 February 1837.

James N. Frost, Deputy Bailiff.

DUNGANNON.

No person has been admitted to the freedom of the corporation.

24 February 1837.

(signed) R. N. Horner, Provost.

ENNIS.

— Note. —

Charles Maler, Provost.

ENNISKILLEN.

The Rev. Samuel Geo. Rogers.	Tullyslay	- clerk	24 June 1831	24 June 1831	by special grace.
Arthur Thompson	Enniskillen	- merchant	24 June 1831	24 June 1831	- ditto.
Baptist G. Frisk	Enniskillen	- medical doctor	6 July 1831	6 July 1831	- ditto.
William Corry	Enniskillen	- esquire	17 Oct. 1831	17 Oct. 1831	- ditto.

Samuel Horne, Provost.
Arthur Thompson, Town Clerk.

KILKENNY.

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right under which admitted.
Richard Perry	Newtown park, county Dublin.	esquire	1 Aug. 1831	not registered	- being married to the daughter of a freeman by favour.
High Broda	city Kilkenny	gentleman	ditto	ditto	- being the son of a freeman.
Edmond Shortall	- ditto	clothier	ditto	ditto	- ditto.
Patrick Watters	- ditto	attorney-at-law	ditto	Oct. 1832	- ditto.
Peter Sheatall	city of Dublin	apothecary	ditto	March 1833	- ditto.
Louisa Marum	- - Seskin Boyce, county Kilkenny.	farmer	ditto	not registered	- ditto.
James Fox	city Kilkenny.	gentleman	6 Jan. 1834	ditto	by favour.
George McDonald	- ditto	dealer	18 Aug. -	ditto	- ditto.
John Páin McCreery	- ditto	gentleman	5 Jan. 1835	March 1835	- being the son of a freeman.
Wm. Michael McCreery	- ditto	surgeon	ditto	ditto	- ditto.
James McCreery, jun.	- ditto	gentleman	ditto	ditto	- ditto.
Richard Wheeler	- ditto	esquire	ditto	ditto	- ditto.
Charles Madden, jun.	- ditto	ditto	ditto	June 1835	- ditto.
Henry Potter	- ditto	shopkeeper	ditto	June 1836	- being married to the daughter of a freeman.
Mat. James O'Donnell	- ditto	barrister-at-law	ditto	Oct. -	- being the son of a freeman.
Christopher James, jun.	- - Derrville liberties, city Kilkenny.	gentleman	19 Jan. 1835	not registered	- ditto.
John Baggy	city Kilkenny	blue dyer	4 Jan. 1836	March 1836	- ditto.
Michael Cody	- ditto	shopkeeper	31 Dec. -	not registered	- ditto.

3 March 1837.

Patrick Watters, Town Clerk.

KINSALE.

Esqr. Edward Green	Kinsale	esquire	18 Oct. 1831	- not sworn a freeman of the corporation	ex gratia - since dead.
Adrianus Damm, jun.	Kinsale	esquire			like.
Tamas Harris	Kinsale	commander, R. N.			like.
Edward Sepple	Kinsale	esquire			like.
Robert Holmes	Kinsale	esquire			like - since dead.
John Jansen	Kinsale	esquire			like.
Edward Bishop	Kinsale	M. D.			like - since dead.
Edmond Bishop, jun.	Kinsale	M. D.			like.
Henry Taylor	Kinsale	commander, R. N.			like.
Edwin Richards	Kinsale	captain, R. N.			like.
Wm. Bishop Dorman	Kinsale	esquire			like.
Sam. Humble Larsson	Kinsale	chief constable police			like.
J. Sprad the younger	Kinsale	esquire			like.
Edward Jago	Kinsale	M. D.			like.
Edw. Bast the younger	Kinsale	esquire			like.
William Baldwin	Kinsale	esquire			like.
Esq. Henry Hamilton	Kinsale	clerk			like.
Rensiah.			same day	like	
Rev. Justin Paley Macconnen.	Kinsale	parish priest			like.
James Pratt	Kinsale	esquire			like.
Lawrence Heyden	Kinsale	gentleman			like.
John Lander Morgan	Kinsale	cabinet-maker			like.
Andrew Leahy	Kinsale	architect			like - since dead.
John Browne	Kinsale	tinber merchant			like.
John Coleman	Kinsale	grocer			like.
James Black	Kinsale	yeoman			like.
Arthur Green	Kinsale	grocer			like.
John Murphy	Kinsale	woollen draper			like.
Standa Leahy	Kinsale	laker			like - since dead.
Charles McCarthy	Kinsale	woollen draper			like.
Patrick Hagan	Kinsale	grocer			like.
Michael Bateman	Kinsale	cooper		- sworn a freeman of the corporation the 24 Oct. 1831.	like.

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right under which admitted.
Richard Smith	Kinsale	cabinet-maker	18 Oct. 1831	- not sworn a freeman of the corporation.	ex gratia.
William Green	Kinsale	earthenware-seller			like - - since dead.
Thomas Hackett	Kinsale	bezier			like - - since dead.
Robert Browne	Kinsale	woollen-draper			like.
John Browne	Kinsale	watchmaker			like.
Mark Donovan	Kinsale	tanner			like.
Webb Nash	Kinsale	esquire			like.
John Purcutt	Kinsale	shopkeeper			like.
Wm. Nicholas Fudge	Kinsale	cordwainer			like.
Haris Fodge	Kinsale	like			like.
Dennis Minheeny	Kinsale	ropemaker			like.
John Armstrong	Kinsale	yeoman			like - - since dead.
John Holland	Kinsale	tobaccoist			like.
Henry Hussey	Kinsale	painter			like.
William Goed	Kinsale	woolcomber			like.
John Murray	Kinsale	grocer			like.
Richard Doyle	Kinsale	painter			like.
Michael Doly	Kinsale	chandler			like.
Denis Sullivan	Kinsale	pawnbroker			like.
Patrick Donovan	Kinsale	leather-cutter			like.
Robert Heard	Kinsale	esquire	same day	like	like.
William Newman the younger.	Kinsale	esquire			like.
Robert Lander	Kinsale	esquire			like.
Wm. George Newman	Kinsale	esquire			like.
George Dunn, jun.	Kinsale	esquire			like.
J. Lichtfield Newman	Kinsale	esquire			like.
John Toohie	Kinsale	cabinet-maker			like.
William Stewart	Kinsale	esquire			like.
James Curran	Kinsale	house-joiner			like - - since dead.
Edward Marning	Kinsale	white-wafer			like.
John Daunt	Silly	esquire			like.
George Dowson	Silly	shipwright			like.
John Black	Charles' feet	serj-major			like.
Arthur Durant	Newborough	esquire			like.
Hill Gilman	Sandy cove	esquire			like.
Thomas Knolles the elder.	Outlands	esquire			like.
Thomas Knolles the younger.	Outlands	esquire			like.
John Howe	Glansverane	esquire			like.
William Rich. Meade	Ballyvaughan	esquire	same day	- - sworn a freeman of the corporation the 16th Sept. 1835	like.
John Heard	Ferry	- - captain North Cork militia.	same day	- not sworn a freeman of the corporation.	like.
Samuel Heard	Somer's cove	esquire			like.
Wm. Henry Heasick	Ship pool	esquire			like.
William Berter	Ballywilliam	esquire			like.
John Bleasley	Ballynacarra	esquire			like.
Thomas Harick	Coolkirkey	esquire			like.
James Barry Gibbons	Ballymacredmond	gentleman			like.
Charles Newman	Ballyhill	esquire			like.
Rev. Wm. Robt. Meade	Temple Michael	clerk			like.
John Edward Heard	- - -	lieut. 6th regiment			like - - since dead.
Joseph Sollen	- - -	lieut. 38th regiment			like - - since dead.
Rev. Richard Looze Connell.	city of Cork	clerk	same day	like	like.
Richard Meade	city of Dublin	attorney-at-law			like.
Jos. Dunn the younger	city of Dublin	attorney-at-law			like.
Rev. Somers Payne	Upton	clerk			like.
James O'Callaghan	Rock cottage	esquire			like.
John Barlow Warren	Ryemount	esquire			like.
Arthur Derman	Harbour hill	esquire			like.
Thomas Hungerford	Cahirmore	esquire			like.

PORTARLINGTON.

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right under which admitted.
James Showcroft	Portarlington	apothecary	7 May 1831	-- 7 May 1831 (sworn.)	-- by memorial of James Showcroft.
John Butler Geoghegan	Portarlington	gentleman	25 June 1831	-- 25 June 1831 (sworn.)	by memorial.
Rev. Sir Erasmus Barrett, bart.	-- Laura, Queen's County.	-- baronet and clerk.	5 Oct. 1835	-- 5 Oct. 1835; sworn 10 Dec. 1835.	-- appointed by unanimous voice and consent at a sovereign court, in the place of a freeman and burgess who had resigned.
Robert Moore, esq.	-- Lanesdowne, Queen's County.	-colony of the Kildare regl.	5 Oct. 1835	-- 5 Oct. 1835; 7 May 1836 sworn.	-- appointed in like manner and for same purpose.
Edward H. Cole, esq.	-- Moore Abbey, co. Kildare.	esquire	5 Oct. 1835	not sworn	-- appointed in like manner and purpose, but not sworn, having resigned.
John Kennis, esq.	-- Knightstown, Queen's County.	esquire	5 Oct. 1835	-- 5 Oct. 1835; sworn 10 Dec. 1835.	-- appointed in like manner and for same purpose.
Owen Cry, esq.	Portarlington	esquire	5 Oct. 1835	-- sworn 10 Dec. 1835.	-- appointed in like manner and for same purpose.
John Theasde, esq.	-- Portmahinch, Queen's County.	esquire	19 Apr. 1836	-- 19 Apr. 1836; sworn 7 May 1836.	-- appointed in like manner and for same purpose.
Chidley Coot, esq.	-- Huntingdon, Queen's County.	esquire	7 May 1836	-- 7 May 1836; sworn 11 May 1836.	-- appointed in like manner and for same purpose.
Rev. George Stopford	-- Coolbunaghe, Queen's County.	-- rector of Coolbunaghe.	7 May 1836	-- 7 May 1836; sworn 7 May 1836.	-- appointed in like manner, and for the purpose of filling a vacancy.

N.B.—If by the above "Date of Registration" is meant the right of voting at elections for Members of Parliament, that registration is made at quarter sessions of the peace; therefore, as sovereign, I have not in my power to make what is may require.

24 February 1837.

Richard Clarke, Sovereign.

NEW ROSS, COUNTY OF WEXFORD.

1. John Loftus Tottenham.	India	esquire	29 June 1831	not registered	-- freeman and burgess, by special favour.
2. Jacob Wm. Goff	-- Harctown, co. Wexford.	esquire	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
3. Shephard French	New Ross	esquire	29 Sep. 1831	-- ditto	-- ditto.
4. William Madden Glussett.	-- Pillstown, co. Wexford.	esquire	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
5. John Usker	Landscape, ditto	esquire	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
6. Rev. Tho. Harman	Pillaco ditto	clerk	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
7. Rev. L. Benks	Ross	clerk	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
8. John Jones	Ross	merchant	10 Mar. 1835	-- ditto	-- ditto.
9. Dr. George Kavagh.	Ross	--	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
10. Thomas Brehan	-- Newtown, co. Wexford.	esquire	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
11. John Boyd	New Ross	merchant	29 June 1835	-- ditto	freeman, by special favour.
12. Thomas Leaphin	ditto	ditto	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
13. William Graves	ditto	ditto	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
14. Edward Carr	ditto	esquire	--	-- ditto	-- freeman and burgess, by special favour.
15. Thomas Carr	-- Armagh, co. Kilkenny.	esquire	--	-- ditto	freeman, by special favour.
16. Martin Howlett	New Ross	esquire, M. D.	--	-- ditto	-- freeman and burgess, by special favour.
17. James Hewlett	ditto	merchant	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
18. John Sutton	-- Irishtown, New Ross.	brewer	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
19. James Mullins	New Ross	esquire, M. D.	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
20. Robert Allen	-- Clodagh, co. Kilkenny.	millar	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
21. Samuel Allen	Ballingroth, ditto	esquire	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.
22. Thomas Jones	-- Crecan, co. Wexford.	esquire	6 July 1835	-- ditto	-- ditto.
23. Richard L. Draper	New Ross	esquire, M. D.	--	-- ditto	-- ditto.

NEW ROSS, COUNTY OF WEXFORD—continued.

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right under which admitted.
24. James Shackell	New Ross	esquire	6 July 1835	not registered	freeman, by special favour.
25. Joseph Williams	ditto	merchant	—	ditto	— ditto.
26. Wm. Dorsey, sen.	ditto	farmer	—	ditto	— ditto.
27. Wm. Dorsey, jun.	ditto	attorney	—	ditto	— ditto.
28. Samuel Handy	ditto	esquire	—	ditto	— freeman and burgess, by special favour.
29. Alex. Napper	ditto	esquire	—	ditto	— freeman, by special favour.
30. Geo. Agar Alexander.	ditto	esquire	—	ditto	— ditto.
31. William Commins	ditto	grocer	—	ditto	— ditto.
32. Richmond Lanchin, jun.	ditto	merchant	—	ditto	— ditto.
33. James Gillman	ditto	woollen-dresser	—	ditto	— ditto.
34. John Sherlock	ditto	shoemaker	—	ditto	— ditto.
35. Martin Power	ditto	coal merchant	—	ditto	— ditto.
36. George Jeffries	ditto	cabinet-maker	—	ditto	— ditto.
37. Patrick Magee	ditto	grocer	—	ditto	— ditto.
38. Wm. Robinson	— Scarb. co. Wexford.	farmer	—	ditto	— ditto.
39. Andrew Whitty	New Ross	watch-maker	—	ditto	— ditto.
40. John Cady	ditto	publian	—	ditto	— ditto.
41. Rich. Elliot French	ditto	grocer	—	ditto	— ditto.
42. Patrick Rehee	ditto	carpenter	—	ditto	— ditto.
43. John Stewart	ditto	shopkeeper	—	ditto	— ditto.
44. William Strongbow Everist.	ditto	ditto	—	ditto	— ditto.
45. Richard Thorpe	— Castle View, co. Wexford.	farmer	—	ditto	— ditto.
46. John Carroll	New Ross	esquire, n. d.	—	ditto	— ditto.
47. Wm. Hamilton Roe	city of Dublin	attorney	29 Sep. 1835	ditto	— freeman and burgess, by special favour.

N. B.—Although the corporation of New Ross admitted all the above-named persons by special favour, as before stated, they have all neglected or refused to accept the compliance conferred on them, except those named in the following numbers, viz. 1. 3. 5. 6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 14 and 20.

Rob. Rogers, Town Clerk.

SLIGO.

Henry Fawcett	Sligo	esquire	2 June 1834	—	by grace special.
---------------	-------	---------	-------------	---	-------------------

John O'nealy, Provost.

TRALEE.

— None. —

Freemen of this corporation having no right of franchise, either previous to or since the passing of the Reform Act, none have been admitted or registered since 1831.

25 February 1837.

Colin Clute, Provost.

WEXFORD.

H. K. G. Morgan	Johnstown Castle	esquire	29 Sep. 1834	2 January 1835	} by special favour.
Major John Doorn	Army	major 10th reg.	—	not registered	
Robt. Wigram Hughes	East Indies	esquire	—	ditto	
John H. Talbot	Bettyville	esquire, n. r.	13 Sep. 1833	ditto	
James Devreux	Dublin	merchant	—	ditto	
Wm. A. Armstrong	Rathmackree	esquire	29 Sep. 1834	2 January 1835	
Robert Stafford, jun.	Wexford	merchant	10 Oct. 1834	not registered	
John Jackson	Ennisceorshy	ditto	30 June 1825	ditto	
James Cullen	ditto	ditto	—	ditto	
Wm. Gafney, jun.	Wexford	ditto	—	ditto	
Peter Doyle	ditto	clerk	—	ditto	
Patrick White	Ennisceorshy	merchant	29 Sep. 1835	ditto	
Robert Prendergast	ditto	ditto	29 June 1830	ditto	

Benjamin Vicary, Town Clerk.

YOUGHAL.

Name.	Residence.	Description.	Date of Admission.	Date of Registration.	Statement of Right under which admitted.
Richard Smyth	Ballinacry	esquire	27 Apr. 1835	22 June 1835	- - by birthright, as eldest son of a freeman.
Sampson Jervis	Youghal	esquire	- - -	22 June 1835	ditto.
James Wallis	Youghal	esquire	- - -	21 Sept. 1835	ditto.
Simon Bagge	Ardmore	esquire	- - -	22 June 1835	ditto.
John Clarke	Youghal	gentleman	- - -	- - -	ditto.
William Gardner	ditto	attorney-at-law	- - -	- - -	ditto.
William Sims	ditto	medical student	- - -	- - -	ditto.
Robert Sangster	ditto	medical student	- - -	- - -	ditto.
Pierre Power	ditto	esquire	- - -	- - -	ditto.
Thomas Cooke, jun.	ditto	medical student	- - -	- - -	ditto.
Christopher Elmore	ditto	esquire	- - -	2 Nov. 1835	ditto.
George Torbeck	ditto	gentleman	16 Sept. 1835	2 Nov. 1835	ditto.
John Rooke	ditto	ship broker	- - -	1 Jan. 1836	ditto.
John Irwin	ditto	doctor of medicine	- - -	1 Jan. 1836	ditto.
John Allen	ditto	shipwright	- - -	2 Nov. 1835	ditto.
Thos. Browning Gardner	ditto	attorney-at-law	- - -	2 Nov. 1835	ditto.
Richard Torbeck	ditto	water bailiff	- - -	2 Nov. 1835	- - by marriage, as married to eldest daughter of a freeman.
Sandish O'Grady	ditto	gentleman	- - -	2 Sept. 1836	ditto.
William Taylor	ditto	merchant's clerk	- - -	- - -	ditto.
John Campbell	ditto	cabinetmaker	- - -	2 Nov. 1835	ditto.
John Fallock, sen.	ditto	attorney-at-law	- - -	2 Nov. 1835	ditto.
James Cardo White	ditto	gentleman	- - -	2 Nov. 1835	ditto.
Richard Cox, jun.	ditto	cooper	- - -	2 Nov. 1835	by birthright.
Rev. Percy Seest Smyth	Monatra	clerk	28 Sept. 1835	2 Nov. 1835	ditto.
John Gillatt Elmore	Youghal	gentleman	- - -	2 Nov. 1835	ditto.
John Fallock, jun.	ditto	attorney-at-law	- - -	2 Nov. 1835	ditto.
Richard Henry Rogers	Killcogh	esquire	- - -	1 Jan. 1836	ditto.
James Boles Johnson	Killcogh	miller	- - -	2 Nov. 1835	by marriage.
Rev. John Garde	Killcogh	clerk	12 Jan. 1836	1 Apr. 1836	ditto.
John Gimlett	Youghal	mariner	- - -	1 Nov. 1836	by birthright.
James Johnson	Killcogh	gentleman	- - -	1 Apr. 1836	ditto.

27 Feb. 1837.

Examined by John Jenkins, Town Clerk.

Wm. A. Lynch, Mayor.

Appendix (B.)

—No. 2.—

FURTHER RETURNS of FREEMEN admitted into Corporations in Ireland, since March 1831.

CARRICKFERGUS.

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DAYS of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right entered but absent.
William Kennedy	County of the Town of Carrickfergus.	labourer	Aug. 1831	Special Sess., Oct. 1833	birth.
Paul Rogers	same	stone-mason	—	like	marriage.
Alexander Jones	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
John McAuley	same	sergent	—	like	birth.
John Purkhill	same	baker	—	like	birth.
William Hall	same	plasterer	—	like	marriage.
Peter Jenkin	same	painter	—	like	birth.
John Turkington	same	gunsmith	—	like	marriage.
James Robison	same	fisher	—	like	birth.
James Basford	same	cooper	—	like	birth.
Samuel Coney	same	labourer	—	like	marriage.
Samuel Hay	same	oil-co-printer	—	like	birth.
William Cunningham	same	carpenter	—	not registered	birth.
Samuel Purdy	same	mariner	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1833	birth.
Patrick Dowlin	same	shoemaker	—	like	marriage.
William Blackburn	same	carpenter	—	like	birth.
John M'Key	same	carpenter	—	not registered	servitude.
Henry Falcon	same	mason	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1833	marriage.
Samuel M'Connell	same	tailor	—	like	servitude.
Samuel Allen	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
Robert M'Heffey	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
Charles M'Murtry	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
Charles M'Auley	same	tailor	—	like	marriage.
William Porter	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
Alexander Thompson	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
James Dorman	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
Henry M'Adam	same	labourer	—	Sessions, Jan. 1833	birth.
Samuel Weatherup	same	weaver	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1833	birth.
James Eskine	same	Gov. of County Antrim gaol	—	not registered	special freem.
Thomas Thompson	same	gentleman	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1833	birth.
Edward Craig	same	gentleman	—	not registered	birth.
Thomas Craig	same	gentleman	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1833	birth.
William Hilditch	same	merchant	—	like	marriage.
John Hasly	same	farmer	—	not registered	special freem.
Thomas Gorman	same	labourer	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1833	birth.
William Lockart	same	saddler	—	like	birth.
Trevor Hill	Wildie Abbey	gentleman	—	not registered	special freem.
William Corcoran	County of the Town of Carrickfergus.	merchant	—	like	marriage.
James M'Skinnin	same	carpenter	—	like	birth.
William M'Conn	same	oil-co-printer	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1833	birth.
James Ferguson	same	machine-maker	—	not registered	marriage.
Robert A. Kidley	same	gentleman	—	like	special freem.
Hugh M'Ilberon	same	grocer	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1833	servitude.
John M'Auley	same	tailor	—	like	birth.
James Graham	same	publican	—	like	servitude.
Alexander M'AEster	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
Nathaniel Moore	same	butcher	—	like	servitude.
James Wilson	same	gentleman	—	like	birth.
John Anderson	same	innkeeper	—	like	birth.
Wilson Boyd	same	gentleman	—	not registered	birth.
Valentine Boyd	same	gentleman	—	like	birth.
William Hasly	same	clerk	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1833	servitude.
Henry Laverty, jun.	same	seaton	—	not registered	birth.

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which elected.
Peter Sinnott	County of the Town of Carrickregan.	innkeeper	Aug. 1851	Special Sess., Oct. 1850	marriage.
Neil Murphy	same	publican	—	like	marriage.
John Allen	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Henry Milbr	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Hugh Stewart	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
John Young	same	weaver	—	like	marriage.
Thomas M'Kee	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
John M'Kee	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Alexander Hamilton	same	printer	—	like	birth.
John M'Kinney	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
John Bradford	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
George Dunn	same	labourer	—	like	marriage.
William Bradford	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
James Wilson	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
John Arkin	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Alexander A skin	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Hugh Smyth	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Thomas Baird	same	labourer	—	like	marriage.
Charles Patterson	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
John Wilson	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
Hugh Whiteford	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
James Bole	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
James Darman	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Samuel Hamilton	same	tailor	—	like	birth.
Robert Hamilton	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
James Hamilton	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
Robert Brennan	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
John Hogan	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
James Campbell	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
William Davison	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Daniel Bolley	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Edward Davy	same	shoemaker	—	like	birth.
Samuel M'Gowan	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
William Rypit	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
James Davy	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Thomas Bradford	same	labourer	—	like	marriage.
Andrew Cowan	same	grocer	—	like	marriage.
James Slane	same	carter	—	like	birth.
John Gerwine	same	carpenter	—	like	birth.
Alexander Davy	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
John Sanderson	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
John Sanderson	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
William Hamilton	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Henry Copeland	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Robert Bole	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
John Leggan	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
Patrick Hamilton	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
James Percy	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Samuel Jankin	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Samuel M'Conkey	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
Richard Cochran	same	cart-maker	—	like	marriage.
John Jankin	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
James Hiney	same	labourer	—	like	marriage.
John Moran	same	shoemaker	—	not registered	birth.
Thomas M'Aughlery	same	nailer	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1850	birth.
John Henderson	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
John Crosby	same	weaver	—	like	servitude.
John Adams	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Andrew Armstrong	same	weaver	—	like	marriage.
William Adamson	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
William Barron	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Joseph Barron	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
John Boyd	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
John Bane	same	fisherman	—	like	birth.
Thomas Boyd	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
Andrew Buryson	same	weaver	—	like	marriage.
Arthur Black	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
John Blackburn	same	blacksmith	—	like	birth.
William Blair	same	shoemaker	—	like	birth.
Henry Beatty	same	fisherman	—	like	birth.
Robert Blackwood	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
John Beatty	same	fisherman	—	like	birth.
William Beatty	same	fisherman	—	like	birth.
James Boyd	same	fisherman	—	like	birth.
John Beary	same	farmer	—	like	marriage.

APPENDIX TO REPORT FROM THE

NAME	RESIDENCE	DESCRIPTION	DATE of Admission	DATE of Registration	STATEMENT of Rights under which admitted
John Cloze	County of the Town of Carrickfergus	shoemaker	Aug. 1831	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	birth
John Caldwell	same	farmer	—	like	birth
Thomas Conbry	same	fisherman	—	like	birth
David Creighton	same	labourer	—	like	marriage
James Cloze	same	carter	—	like	marriage
John Curry	same	weaver	—	like	birth
James Craig	same	labourer	—	like	marriage
James Cope	same	shoemaker	—	like	service
James Conway	same	fisherman	—	like	birth
James Colville	same	farmer	—	like	marriage
Nathaniel Cameron	same	weaver	—	Sessions, Jan. 1833	birth
Edward Connor	same	labourer	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	birth
James Campbell	same	labourer	—	like	marriage
Samuel Cullarwood	same	farmer	—	like	birth
William Davison	same	fisherman	—	like	birth
William Donaldson	same	carter	—	like	birth
Alexander Donaldson	same	labourer	—	like	birth
Thomas Donald	same	weaver	—	like	birth
Patrick Donnelly	same	weaver	—	like	marriage
William Donnelly	same	schoolmaster	—	like	marriage
Mathew Davidson	same	schoolmaster	—	like	marriage
James Davy	same	fisherman	—	like	birth
John Davison	same	fisherman	—	like	birth
John Davy	same	fisherman	—	like	birth
John Finney	same	labourer	—	like	marriage
Arthur Graham	same	mason	—	like	birth
Hugh Gormel	same	labourer	—	like	birth
John Gardner	same	weaver	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	marriage
William Goutley	same	labourer	—	like	marriage
Samuel Guedner	same	farmer	—	Sessions, Jan. 1833	birth
Robert Gordon	same	farmer	—	like	birth
High Cameron	same	mason	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	marriage
Andrew Curry	same	labourer	—	like	marriage
James Campbell	same	weaver	—	like	marriage
Alexander Gyle	same	weaver	—	like	birth
John Hamilton	same	shoemaker	—	like	birth
James Haggin	same	weaver	—	like	birth
John Herschy	same	weaver	—	like	birth
Robert Henderson	same	printer	—	like	birth
Edward Hay	same	blacksmith	—	like	birth
William Hutchison	same	shoemaker	—	like	birth
John Hamilton	same	shoemaker	—	like	birth
James Hunter	same	merchant	—	like	birth
John Hilditch	same	weaver	—	like	marriage
Hugh Harrison	same	carpenter	—	like	marriage
Mathew Hilton	same	mason	—	like	birth
Thomas Herdman	same	mariner	—	like	birth
Hugh Alexander Hara	same	farmer	—	like	birth
John Hamilton	same	weaver	—	like	birth
Thomas Jamison	same	labourer	—	like	birth
Samuel Jenkins	same	sailor	—	like	birth
James Johnston	same	labourer	—	like	marriage
Charles Johnston	same	farmer	—	like	birth
John Irvine	same	gunsmith	—	like	birth
David Kennedy	same	labourer	—	like	birth
Alexander Kellet	same	labourer	—	like	birth
William Kin Keade	same	labourer	—	like	birth
James Kennedy	same	labourer	—	like	marriage
John Kellet	same	labourer	—	like	birth
Archibald Larmour	same	shoemaker	—	like	birth
John Logan	same	weaver	—	like	birth
Thomas Hamilton	same	shoemaker	—	like	birth
James Lavery	same	shoemaker	—	like	birth
Joseph Legg	same	fisherman	—	like	birth
David Logan	same	labourer	—	like	birth
John Lavery	same	labourer	—	like	birth
James Miller	same	labourer	—	like	birth
Robert Milburn	same	labourer	—	like	birth
Thomas Murphy	same	farmer	—	like	marriage
David Milliken	same	fisher	—	like	birth
William Martin	same	farmer	—	like	birth
William Milliken	same	tailor	—	like	birth
Thomas Morris	same	mason	—	not registered	marriage
David Moore	same	labourer	—	Sessions, Jan. 1833	marriage
John Mayne	same	labourer	—	like	birth

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which obtained.
Samuel Murry	County of the Town of Carrickfergus.	fisherman	Aug. 1831	- Sessions, Jan. 1832	birth
William Martin	same	weaver	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	marriage.
Samuel Morrison	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Mathew Mayne	same	carpenter	—	like	birth.
John Mulholland	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
Samuel Mayne	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
Charles Mulholland	same	calico-printer	—	like	birth.
Patrick McGill	same	labourer	—	—	—
Hugh Micoomple	same	carpenter	—	- Sessions, Jan. 1833	marriage.
Robert McCannan	same	publian	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	birth.
David McAlpine	same	fisherman	—	like	birth.
William McKinsty	same	painter	—	like	birth.
Alexander McAlpine	same	fisherman	—	like	servitude.
Edward McGowan	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Robert McDowell	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
John McAuley	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Henry McManus	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
James McAlister	same	weaver	—	like	servitude.
David McDowell	same	yeoman	—	like	marriage.
Thomas McMeekin	same	fisherman	—	like	birth.
William McFerran	same	fisherman	—	like	birth.
James McFerran	same	fisherman	—	like	birth.
Mathew McHaffey	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Hugh McAlpine	same	fisherman	—	like	marriage.
Charles McAuley	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
James McAlister	same	labourer	—	like	marriage.
Philip McAlpine	same	fisherman	—	like	birth.
Joseph McMaster	same	fisherman	—	like	birth.
Hugh McDowell	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
Robert McAlexander	same	farmer	—	—	—
William McFannoy	same	labourer	—	- Sessions, Jan. 1833	marriage.
John McKee	same	blacksmith	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	birth.
John McAuley	same	labourer	—	- Sessions, Jan. 1833	marriage.
James McConlough	same	labourer	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	marriage.
William McBrian	same	labourer	—	- Sessions, Jan. 1833	marriage.
John McFerran	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
John McDowell	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Robert McDowell	same	carpenter	—	like	birth.
John McMurry	same	labourer	—	—	—
William McFannoy	same	labourer	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	birth.
William McKee	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Edward McQuillan	same	chandler	—	like	birth.
Robert McBrada	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
Henry McGolpin	same	labourer	—	like	marriage.
Patrick McCann	same	butcher	—	like	birth.
Robert McQuillan	same	carman	—	like	marriage.
John McKinsty	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
William McDowell	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
William McFannoy	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
William McKean	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
William McMaster	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Thomas McCann	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
David McCannan	same	murder	—	like	birth.
James McCourtney	same	farmer	—	like	birth.
Hugh McAuley	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
William McAuley Stuart	same	labourer	—	like	marriage.
John McAuley	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Mathew Patterson	same	labourer	—	not registered	birth.
Samuel Parry	same	weaver	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	birth.
James Peadar	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Paul Picken	same	labourer	—	- Sessions, Jan. 1833	birth.
Thomas Penny	same	labourer	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	birth.
Archibald Robinson	same	weaver	—	like	birth.
Lake Reilly	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
William Rippon	same	huntsman	—	like	marriage.
Edward Reilly	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
William Reilly	same	shoemaker	—	like	birth.
Thomas Reid	same	shoemaker	—	like	birth.
John Ross	same	labourer	—	like	birth.
Thomas Sloan	same	farmer	—	- Sessions, Jan. 1833	birth.
Joseph Shields	same	farmer	—	like	marriage.
William Shearer	same	chandler	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	marriage.
Samuel Simon	same	shoemaker	—	like	birth.
John Smyth	same	farmer	—	- Sessions, Jan. 1833	birth.
James Shearer	same	labourer	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	birth.
		fisherman	—	like	birth.

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which admitted.
John Smyth	County of the Town of Carrickfergus.	weaver	Aug. 1831	Sessions, Jan. 1833	birth.
Andrew Stuart	— same —	carpenter	—	Special Sew., Oct. 1832	birth.
Thomas Thompson	— same —	labourer	—	— like —	birth.
James Wilson	— same —	labourer	—	Sessions, Jan. 1833	birth.
John Wisnom	— same —	labourer	—	Special Sess., Oct. 1832	marriage.
James Warren	— same —	plasterer	—	— like —	marriage.
Alexander Wisnom	— same —	shoemaker	—	— like —	birth.
John Wisnom	— same —	shoemaker	—	— like —	birth.
James Weatherup	— same —	tailor	—	— like —	birth.
John Wisnom	— same —	labourer	—	— like —	birth.
Isaac Wisnom	— same —	labourer	—	— like —	birth.
William White	— same —	labourer	—	Sessions, Jan. 1833	marriage.

Note.—Exclusive of those named in the foregoing Returns, other persons took the oath of freemen of said Corporation since March 1831, but they not having paid the stamp duty imposed on their admission, do not appear as freemen in the records, nor can they be recognized as such, or exercise the rights.

Dated this 6th day of March 1837.

Adam Cunningham,
Town Clerk.

CASHEL

Thomas Bourke	Prospect Villa, Co. Wick.	esquire	29 June 1831	same as date of admission.	By special force.
John White	Cashel	esquire	— 1832	ditto	
Bailey Upton	ditto	gentleman	—	ditto	According to ancient custom, the mayor having officiated the same evening into other names such as follows.
Benj. A. White	ditto	esquire	— 1833	ditto	
Richard Long	Longfield, Cashel	esquire	29 Sept. —	ditto	By special force, and right of office to hold.
Daniel Mansergh	Ballydoohan, ditto	esquire	—	ditto	
Richard Cragh, sen.	Castlepark, Golden	esquire	—	ditto	According to ancient custom, as above.
Samsel Cooper	Rock View, Cashel	esquire	—	ditto	
John Stanley	Cashel	gentleman	— 1834	ditto	According to ancient custom, as above.
William Ryall	ditto	postmaster	—	ditto	
Henry C. White	Golden Hills, Golden.	esquire	—	ditto	According to ancient custom, as above.
James Graham	Cashel	apothecary	—	ditto	
Rev. James Mansergh	Lismolin, Killmanagh	clerk	—	ditto	According to ancient custom, as above.
George Evans	Cashel	esquire	—	ditto	
Nicholas Herbert	Knockraffon, Glaha, Cashel.	clerk	— 1835	ditto	According to ancient custom, as above.
John Langley	Gralla, Lisdalen	esquire	—	ditto	
Austin Cooper	Kilmore, Cashel	esquire	—	ditto	According to ancient custom, as above.
Richard Price	Ardsmyre, ditto	esquire	—	ditto	
George Minchin	Rock Abbey, ditto	esquire	— 1836	ditto	According to ancient custom, as above.
Law. Creagh	Castlepark, Golden	esquire	—	ditto	
George Ryall	Ballykelly, Cashel	farmer	—	ditto	According to ancient custom, as above.
Thomas Ryall	Garrishally	farmer	—	ditto	

Acery Jordan,
Town Clerk.

COLERAINE

Samsel Knox	Coleraine	attorney-at-law	1 Oct. 1831	same as date of admission.	As a qualification by charter, as being elected a member of the corporation.
Henry Marquis of Waterford	Carraghmore	—	— 1832	ditto	
Joshiah Bryan	Magheraish	gentleman	14 — 1831	ditto	Elected freemen in the year 1797, as a compliment for their loyalty and zeal as members of a yeomanry corps.
Robert McNaghden	Coleraine	attorney-at-law	—	ditto	
Alexander Laurence	ditto	gentleman	—	ditto	Elected freemen in the year 1797, as a compliment for their loyalty and zeal as members of a yeomanry corps.
Arthur Long	ditto	yeoman	—	ditto	
Archibald McPetrich	ditto	tailor	—	ditto	Elected freemen in the year 1797, as a compliment for their loyalty and zeal as members of a yeomanry corps.
James Dunlop	ditto	whip-maker	—	ditto	
William Lake	ditto	labourer	—	ditto	Elected freemen in the year 1797, as a compliment for their loyalty and zeal as members of a yeomanry corps.
John Gray (since dead)	ditto	labourer	—	ditto	
George Long (ditto)	ditto	tailor	—	ditto	Elected freemen in the year 1797, as a compliment for their loyalty and zeal as members of a yeomanry corps.
George McFadden	ditto	serjeant-at-mace	—	ditto	
Jas. Melloy (since dead)	ditto	shoemaker	—	ditto	Elected freemen in the year 1797, as a compliment for their loyalty and zeal as members of a yeomanry corps.
Thomas Lindy	ditto	tailor	—	ditto	
Joseph Bailey	ditto	shoemaker	—	ditto	Elected freemen in the year 1797, as a compliment for their loyalty and zeal as members of a yeomanry corps.
Neal Doherty	ditto	stone-mason	—	ditto	
John Humea	Ballymonee	flux-dresser	—	ditto	Elected freemen in the year 1797, as a compliment for their loyalty and zeal as members of a yeomanry corps.
J. Magee (since dead)	Coleraine	shoemaker	—	ditto	
James Moore	Ballykern	labourer	—	ditto	Elected freemen in the year 1797, as a compliment for their loyalty and zeal as members of a yeomanry corps.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[77

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which admitted.
Alexander McDonnell	Colemaine	labourer	14 Oct. 1831	same as date of admission.	Elected freemen in the year 1793, as a compliment for their loyalty and zeal as members of a yeomanry corps.
Patrick McCormick	ditto	stone-mason	—	ditto	
John McGeoghegan	ditto	painter	—	ditto	For like reasons.
Henry Hill	Erinshaven	stone-mason	—	ditto	
James Black (since dead)	Colemaine	merchant	18 Aug. 1832	ditto	
James Ewing (ditto)	ditto	shoemaker	—	ditto	
Andrew Keith (ditto)	ditto	labourer	—	ditto	
William Jackson	ditto	tailor	—	ditto	
Henry Richardson	Somerscot	esquire	1 Oct. —	ditto	
John Moore Tittle	Farrhill	esquire	—	ditto	
Henry O'Hara	Rock Castle	esquire	—	ditto	
Thomas Bennett	Ballywrit	esquire	30 Oct. 1830	ditto	
J. S. Green (since dead)	Colinckill	esquire	1 —	ditto	As a qualification by charter, on being elected members of the corporation.
Samuel Wright Knox	Colemaine	attorney-at-law	—	ditto	
Robert Huson	ditto	surgeon	—	ditto	
James Hussey	Castleroe	esquire	—	ditto	
Alexander Neill	Colemaine	surgeon	—	ditto	
Benjamin Gwin	ditto	merchant	—	ditto	
Andrew Orr	Keely	esquire	—	ditto	
Thomas Black	Colemaine	merchant	—	ditto	
Richard Bennett	Ardenness	esquire	19 —	ditto	
Peter Murphy	Craun	farmer	24 —	ditto	
David Dunkin (since dead)	Ballyghron	clerk	—	ditto	Admitted under the construction put upon a Resolution of a Committee of the House of Commons, on the trial of the Colemaine Election Petition in the year 1835.
William Mill	Ballywillen	clerk	—	ditto	
Joseph Wilson	Ballygallen	farmer	20 Dec. —	ditto	
Matthew Long	Colemaine	serjeant-at-law	20 —	ditto	
John Troy	ditto	bedman	—	ditto	
John Elliott Cairnes	Portewart	colonel on half-pay	—	ditto	
Thomas Capple	Ballymahaw	clerk	1 April 1834	ditto	
Samuel Byrne	Brookhall	gentleman	4 —	ditto	
Andrew Brewer	Colemaine	parier	7 —	ditto	
James Edmund Leslie	Beardville	esquire	1 Oct. —	ditto	
Stewart Crawford Bruce	Millburn	esquire	8 Dec. —	ditto	
John Wilson	Drumcroon	linendraper	14 Mar. 1835	ditto	As a qualification by charter, on being elected members of the corporation.
Robert Knox	Rushbrook	linendraper	—	ditto	
Alex. Orr (since dead)	Portewart	esquire	6 April —	ditto	
Alexander Major	ditto	esquire	28 Sep. —	ditto	
John Boye	Brookhall	gentleman	—	ditto	
John Gamble (since dead)	Dromore	gentleman	17 Oct. —	ditto	
John C. W. Leslie	Leslie Hill	esquire	15 Dec. —	ditto	
Henry Leslie	ditto	esquire	19 —	ditto	
William Hunter	Lodge	esquire	1 Oct. 1836	ditto	

4 March 1837.

John Boyd,
Clerk.

GALWAY.

Marin Armstrong	Presentation-road, Galway.	cooper	18 Sept. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	as a cooper.
Patrick Atkinson	same	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
John Armstrong	same	cooper	same	same	as a cooper.
George Atkin	Back-street	merchant	same	same	as a merchant.
William Anderson	Earl's Island	bleacher	same	same	as a bleacher.
John Anderson	Shop-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
George M. Anderson	same	same	same	same	same.
Henry Boyle	Market-street	merchant	same	same	as a merchant.
Thomas Broderick	Battermill-lane	surveyor	same	same	as a surveyor.
Michael Burke	William-street	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Christopher Bollen	Shop-street	apothecary	same	same	as an apothecary.
Nicholas Burke	Abbeygate-street	brewer	same	same	as a brewer.
Edmund Burke	Market-street	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Anthony Brady	Muglin's-lane	skinner	same	same	as a skinner.
James Burke	West William-st.	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Michael Briggs	Bridge-street	ship-carpenter	same	same	as a ship-carpenter.
James Brett	Middle-street	barber	same	same	as a barber.
William Briggs	Cloddagh	ship-carpenter	same	same	as a ship-carpenter.
Amos Burke	Nuns' Island	paper-maker	same	same	as a paper-maker.
John Burke	Middle-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Myke Burke	Wood Quay	slater	same	same	as a slater.
Patrick Burke	Lombard-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Michael Balger	Nuns' Island	mason	same	same	as a mason.
Peter Browne	Henry-street, West	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Light under which admitted.
Mark Burke	Henry-street, West	tailor	16 Sept. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	as a tailor.
James Bulger	Nans' Island	mason	same	same	as a mason.
Patrick Brennan	West Suburbs	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
William Bourassa	Talbot	same	same	same	same.
Peter Brennan	Upp. Dominick-st.	hrazier	same	same	as a hrazier.
Michael Burns	Eyre-street	painter	same	same	as a painter.
William Burke	Bohemore	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Michael Buscico	Shop-street	baker	same	same	as a baker.
John Burns	William's-gate	same	same	same	same.
John Burke	Bohemore	mason	same	same	as a mason.
John Burke	Cross-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Walter Burke	High-street	baker	same	same	as a baker.
James Burke	Long-walk	hatter	same	same	as a hatter.
Patrick Burns	William-st., West	wheelwright	same	same	as a wheelwright.
Anthony Burke	Main Guard	cooper	same	same	as a cooper.
John Burke	Shop-street	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Thomas Bath	William-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Nicholas Bath	Abbeygate-street	same	same	same	same.
Patrick Baux	Barna	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
William Bevilly	Abbeygate-street	painter	same	same	as a painter.
Joseph Bright	Upp. Dominick-st.	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
William Bright	Courthouse-lane	same	same	same	same.
Joseph Bright	Upp. Dominick-st.	same	same	same	same.
Henry Bright	Bridge-street	same	same	same	same.
John Burke	Kirwan's-lane	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
William Cavanagh	Lombard-street	same	same	same	same.
John Cullen	Church-lane	joiner	same	same	as a joiner.
Patrick Conaly	Kelly's-lane	brague-maker	same	same	as a brague-maker.
Seamus Conry	Whitehall	cabinet-maker	same	same	as a cabinet-maker.
Samuel Carter	Eyre-street	vessel-maker	same	same	as a vessel-maker.
John Conolly	Buttermilk-lane	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Charles Costello	Shop-street	vintner and dealer	same	same	as a vintner and dealer.
John Casady	High-street	confectioner	same	same	as a confectioner.
John Casady	Dominick-street	mercht. & shopkeeper	same	same	as a merchant & shopkeeper.
Hugh Casady	High-street	confectioner	same	same	as a confectioner.
Thomas Casary	Main Guard	chandler	same	same	as a chandler.
Myka Coen	Eyre-street	house-carpenter	same	same	as a house-carpenter.
Bartholomew Cain	Shop-street	joiner	same	same	as a joiner.
Patrick Connors	William-street	mercht. & shopkeeper	same	same	as a merchant & shopkeeper.
Peter Carr	same	trader	same	same	as a trader.
Joseph Conroy	Sea-road	land-surveyor	same	same	as a surveyor.
George Coleman	Cross-street	hat-manufacturer	same	same	as a hat-manufacturer.
John Cain	Buttermilk-lane	joiner	same	same	as a joiner.
Dennis Clarke	Flood-street	merchant	same	same	as a merchant.
Patrick Collaghan	Bridge-street	vintner	same	same	as a vintner.
Thomas Courcy	Upp. Dominick-st.	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Patrick Casey	Bohemore	turner	same	same	as a turner.
Thomas Coffey	Bohemore	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
James Costello	Eyre-square	merchant	same	same	as a merchant.
John Cavanagh	Spanish-parade	stone-mason	same	same	as a stone-mason.
Patrick Cahell	Nans' Island	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Thomas Costello	College-road	trader	same	same	as a trader.
Bartholomew Casack	Market-street	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
James Corrigan	Henry-st., West	stone-mason	same	same	as a stone-mason.
John Connor	Wood Quay	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Patrick Casack	College-road	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Stephen Congreve	Whitehall	vintner	same	same	as a vintner.
Andrew Coen	Abbey-lane	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Stephen Curran	West William-st.	blacksmith	same	same	as a blacksmith.
James Callaghan	Parkover	vintner	same	same	as a vintner.
John Cavanagh	Bohemore	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
John Carry	Upper Henry-st.	smith	same	same	as a smith.
Paul Corney	Henry-street	brague-maker	same	same	as a brague-maker.
Patrick Coen	Eyre-street	cooper	same	same	as a cooper.
Joseph Coony	Whitehall	turner	same	same	as a turner.
Patrick Cooke	Upp. Dominick-st.	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
John Coffey	Lombard-street	cabinet-maker	same	same	as a cabinet-maker.
Patrick Coppinger	Abbey-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
John Conway	Abbeygate-street	turner	same	same	as a turner.
Peter Cleary	Kelly's-lane	brague-maker	same	same	as a brague-maker.
Paul Corlacy	Henry-st., West	same	same	same	as a brague-maker.
Philip Calnan	same	same	same	same	as a brague-maker.
Conor Caine	West Suburbs	same	same	same	as a brague-maker.
Patrick Calan	West Suburbs	clothier	same	same	as a clothier.
Patrick Curley	William-street	brague-maker	same	same	as a brague-maker.
Patrick Curley	Kelly's-lane	same	same	same	as a brague-maker.
Nicholas Connel	Shop-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Michael Crane	Lombard-street	same	same	same	as a shoemaker.

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which elected.
James Cunningham	Lombard-street	tinplate-worker	18 Sept. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	as a tinplate-worker.
Simon Casey	Kelly's-lane	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Dominick Cleberly	Henry-st., West	brogue-maker	same	same	as a brogue-maker.
Patrick Carroll	Lombard-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
John Cassidy	New-road	same	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Mathew Conner	Abbey-street	cooper	same	same	as a cooper.
John Curran	Kelly's-lane	brogue-maker	same	same	as a brogue-maker.
Patrick Cavanagh	College-road	mason	same	same	as a mason.
Frederick Carteaux	Eyre-square	saddler	same	same	as a saddler.
Martin Corney	Albany-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Hugh Costello	Bohemore	butcher	same	same	as a butcher.
John Crafield	Bowling-green	mason	same	same	as a mason.
Lazence Cosmanon	Lombard-street	surveyor	same	same	as a surveyor.
John Crossin	New-road	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Stephen Conolly	Eyre-street	surveyor	same	same	as a surveyor.
Michael Cosgroin	West [sic]	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Patrick Cosmoss	Henry-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
John Clarke	Church-lane	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Peter Cannon	Henry-street	cooper	same	same	as a cooper.
John Conner	Eyre-square	same	same	same	same.
Luke Callaghan	Porkavem	victualler	same	same	as a victualler.
William Conolly	Eyre-street	surveyor	same	same	as a surveyor.
James Curtin	Eyre-street	printer	same	same	as a printer.
Owen Conolly	Tullibeg	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Thomas Collins	Green	same	same	same	same.
John Curran	Henry-street	blacksmith	same	same	as a blacksmith.
Patrick Costello	Middle-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Patrick Collins	Hanbury's-lane	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
James Cosgriff	New-road	mason	same	same	as a mason.
James Cosidine	Quay-street	trader	same	same	as a trader.
David Cosidine	same	same	same	same	same.
Colant Chambers	Green	saddler	same	same	as a saddler.
Richard Collins	Kelly's-lane	tanner	same	same	as a tanner.
William Clifford	Middle-street	leather-cutter	same	same	as a leather-cutter.
William Clarke	College-road	architect	same	same	as an architect.
Thomas Cusdcock	Merlin-park	blacksmith	same	same	as a blacksmith.
Patrick Cusdcock, sen.	same	same	same	same	same.
Patrick Cusdcock, jun.	same	same	same	same	same.
Michael Curran	Kelly's-lane	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Michael Costello	same	brogue-maker	same	same	as a brogue-maker.
James Conolly	same	same	same	same	same.
Thomas Cullen	New-road	paper-maker	same	same	as a paper-maker.
James Congan	same	same	same	same	same.
William Cleary	same	printer	same	same	as a printer.
John Connor	Suckeen	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Michael Conner	same	same	same	same	same.
James Curran	William-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
John Callinan	Nine's Island	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Mark Connor	Cladagh	shipwright	same	same	as a shipwright.
Martin Conner	same	same	same	same	same.
Henry Conesford	Merchaunt's-road	merchaunt	same	same	as a merchaunt.
James Conner	Berna	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Mark Connor	Cladagh	rope-maker	same	same	as a rope-maker.
Owen Connor	Cladagh	shipwright	same	same	as a shipwright.
Patrick Collins	Newcastle	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
James Croughan	Lombard-street	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Patrick Connell	Bohemore	mason	same	same	as a mason.
James Carr	William-street	baker	same	same	as a baker.
Thomas Carr	Eyre-street	coach-maker	same	same	as a coach-maker.
Owen Cosmoss	Bridge-street	butcher	same	same	as a butcher.
William Cosmoss	Bohemore	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Patrick Cosmoss	Shop-street	shaver	same	same	as a shaver.
Joseph Cosely	Church-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Thomas Coders	Bohemore	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Thomas Cusack	Lombard-street	same	same	same	same.
Thomas Conolly	West Suburbs	iron-founder	same	same	as an iron-founder.
Henry Clure	West Suburbs	same	same	same	same.
John Connor	Bohsbeg	marble manufact.	same	same	as a marble manufacturer.
Thomas Conolly	Kelly's-lane	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Patrick Devitt	Back-street	tobacco-spinner	same	same	as a tobacco-spinner.
Colin Dorr	Abbeygate-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
James Daly	Market-street	cooper	same	same	as a cooper.
Thomas Durkin	Bowling-green	skinner	same	same	as a skinner.
Pat Devney	Suckeen	millor	same	same	as a millor.
Conchobas Daly	Upp. Dominick-st.	tanner	same	same	as a tanner.
James Duric	Abbeygate-street	cooper	same	same	as a cooper.
Pat. Daffy	Mataguard-street	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
	Mary's-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.

(continued)

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which admitted.
Michael Donelan	Up. Dominick-st.	millor	18 Sept. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	as a miller
Thomas Dempsey	Nurs' Island	sawyer	same	same	as a sawyer.
Austin Deiscoil	Bowling-green	clothes	same	same	as a clothes.
Patrick Deun	Middle-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Michael D'Ally	Lombard-street	same	same	same	same.
Roger Degan	Suckeen	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Patrick Deherby	Tullihag	same	same	same	same.
Patrick Delly	Barna	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
William Delly	same	same	same	same	same.
Anthony Duddy	Suckeen	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Patrick Dempsey	Henry-street, West	millor	same	same	as a miller.
Patrick Deane	Up. Dominick-st.	same	same	same	same.
William Devery, jun.	Church-lane	printer	same	same	as a printer.
Luke Dodgeworth	Cross-street	same	same	same	same.
Darby Duggan	Market-street	corn-dealer	same	same	as a corn-dealer.
Beina Duggan	same	same	same	same	same.
John Duggan	Shop-street	shopkeeper	same	same	as a shopkeeper.
Michael Duggan	same	auctioneer	same	same	as an auctioneer.
John Dooley	Nurs' Island	millwright	same	same	as a millwright.
John Duane	Kay-street	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
John Dully	Abbeygate-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Peter Dugdale	West William-st.	blacksmith	same	same	as a blacksmith.
John Dugdale	same	same	same	same	same.
Laurence Deuse	Monster-lane	broguesmaker	same	same	as a broguesmaker.
William Dempsey	New-road	tobacco-spinner	same	same	as a tobacco-spinner.
Michael Dowling	High-street	cloth-merchant	same	same	as a cloth-merchant.
Hugh Doven	Marchants'-road	blacksmith	same	same	as a blacksmith.
James Doven	New-road	plasterer	same	same	as a plasterer.
Patrick Doven	Hushury-lane	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
John Dwyer	Abbeygate-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Thomas Dempsey	Bohemore	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
John Delany	Wood-quay	slater	same	same	as a slater.
Michael Duddy	Long-road	same	same	same	same.
Thomas Edward	Bowling-green	violinist	same	same	as a violinist.
Thomas Eardly	Shop-street	hatter	same	same	as a hatter.
James Eardly	Cross-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
William Eanis	Bowling-green	malster	same	same	as a malster.
Matthew Eanis	Mary-street	same	same	same	same.
William Edward	Bowling-green	violinist	same	same	as a violinist.
John Egan	Bridge-street	same	same	same	same.
Patrick Eadly	Flood-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
James Edward	Bowling-green	violinist	same	same	as a violinist.
Matthew Fackerly	West William-st.	shopkeeper	same	same	as a shopkeeper.
Patrick Fitzgerald	Bark-street	brewer	same	same	as a brewer.
Francis Fitzgerald	same	merchant	same	same	as a merchant.
Patrick Flaherty	William-street	chandler	same	same	as a chandler.
Michael Flaherty	Claddagh	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Edward Folan	Bowling-green	skinner	same	same	as a skinner.
Thomas Flaherty	Dominick-street	tanner	same	same	as a tanner.
Barry Flanagan	Tullihag	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Patrick Franc	Quay-street	painter	same	same	as a painter.
Patrick Flaherty	Cross-street	cabinet-maker	same	same	as a cabinet-maker.
Edmund Finaghty	Spanish-parade	ship-carpenter	same	same	as a ship carpenter.
Patrick Flaherty	Bohemore	mason	same	same	as a mason.
Thomas Flaherty	Up. Dominick-st.	millor	same	same	as a miller.
John Flaherty	Claddagh	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Luke Fallon	same	same	same	same	as a carpenter.
Thomas Fallon	Bohemore	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Edward Fineran	same	same	same	same	same.
Thomas Folan	Wood-quay	millwright	same	same	as a millwright.
John Fleming	Parkovera	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
John Flynn	Abbeygate-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Patrick Fahy	Bohemore	same	same	same	same.
Mark Finegan	Market-street	corn-merchant	same	same	as a corn-merchant.
Patrick Ferry	Henry-st., West	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
William Fahy	Bohemore	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Dominick Flaherty	Market-street	corn-dealer	same	same	as a corn-dealer.
Darby Freeman	West-suburbs	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
James Ford	William-st., West	millwright	same	same	as a millwright.
Michael Fletcher	Cross-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
David Flynn	Long-road	slater	same	same	as a slater.
Edward Fynn	Prospect-hill	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Philip Flaherty	Hinbury's-lane	baker	same	same	as a baker.
David Flanagan	West-suburbs	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Bartholomew Folan	Wood-quay	sawyer	same	same	as a sawyer.
Thomas Fahy	Barna	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Thomas Fahy	same	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[81

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which admitted.
Thoby Folan	Berna	weaver	18 Sept. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	as a weaver.
Water Flaherty	Bobermore	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Michael Forde	Nuns' Island	painter and glazier	same	same	as a painter and glazier.
John Flaherty	Bobermore	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Mark Flaherty	same	same	same	same	same.
Patrick Francis	Suckoon	same	same	same	same.
Ned Francis	Whitehall	same	same	same	same.
John Fitzavaries	Mainguard	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Patrick Field	Martin's-lane	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Thomas Folan	Berna	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Bartholomew Folan	same	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
John Flynn	Abbeypate-street	butcher	same	same	as a butcher.
Edward Good	same	visitor or dealer	same	same	as a visitor or dealer.
John Golden	same	shopkr. or trader	same	same	as a shopkeeper or trader.
John Grealy	William-street	trader	same	same	as a trader.
Lourence Geoghagan	Buttermilk-lane	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
John Geoghagan	Mechanics-road	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
James Gunning	Bowling-green	merchant & tanner	same	same	as a merchant and tanner.
John Gunning	same	same	same	same	same.
Peter Grealy	same	leather-cutter	same	same	as a leather-cutter.
Terence Gunning	same	skinner	same	same	as a skinner.
William Greeney	Kelly's-lane	tanner	same	same	as a tanner.
Michael Glynn	Shop-street	leather-cutter	same	same	as a leather-cutter.
Thomas Green	Bobermore	brogue-maker	same	same	as a brogue-maker.
Patrick Gannon	Upp. Dominick-st.	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Thomas Gynn	Parkovera	maason	same	same	as a maason.
Francis Gynn	Rosemary-lane	same	same	same	same.
Patrick Gill	Whitehall	printer	same	same	as a printer.
Richard Gurrot	Shop-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
John Giffen	Middle-street	same	same	same	same.
John Glynn	Presentation-road	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Michael Glynn	Market-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Patrick Griffin	West-street	maason	same	same	as a maason.
Tim Glyn	Bowling-green	same	same	same	same.
Patrick Glynn	College-road	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Daniel Gaugan	Berna	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Jeremiah Glyn	Eye-street	maason	same	same	as a maason.
Durig Geauy	Berna	smith	same	same	as a smith.
Michael Glynn	Dominick-street	millmaker	same	same	as a millmaker.
John Geauy	Lombard-street	gunsmith	same	same	as a gunsmith.
Lourence Gilmore	Kingston	smith	same	same	as a smith.
Patrick Geauy	Lombard-street	gunsmith	same	same	as a gunsmith.
Michael Gill	Wood-quay	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Patrick Gannon	Buttermilk-lane	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
John Geau	West suburbs	dye	same	same	as a dye.
Thomas Green	Bowling-green	mill	same	same	as a miller.
Michael Grady	Kirwan's-lane	painter	same	same	as a painter.
Michael Glynn	Eye-street	maason	same	same	as a maason.
William Glynn	College-road	same	same	same	same.
William Grealy	Courthouse-lane	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
James Garden	Market-street	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Mark Garden	Quay-street	same	same	same	same.
William Geauy	Upp. Dominick-st.	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
William Gray	Mainguard-street	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
John Gannon	Kelly's-lane	brogue-maker	same	same	as a brogue-maker.
James Graham	Quay-street	visitor	same	same	as a visitor.
Austin Graham	same	ship-carpenter	same	same	as a ship-carpenter.
John Gannon	Kelly's-lane	brogue-maker	same	same	as a brogue-maker.
John Golden	Henry-street	starch-maker	same	same	as a starch-maker.
Timothy Glynn	Bobermore	maason	same	same	as a maason.
Thomas Glynn	Quay-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
William Guffin	same	Sawyer	same	same	as a Sawyer.
Patrick Griffin	Shop-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Michael Griffin	same	same	same	same	same.
Joseph Grealy	Mainguard-street	mill	same	same	as a miller.
John Glynn	Bobermore	maason	same	same	as a maason.
Patrick Glynn	same	same	same	same	same.
Tim Gannon	Claddagh	mill	same	same	as a miller.
Patrick Green	Lombard-street	tinman	same	same	as a tinman.
Michael Green	Bowling-green	same	same	same	same.
Michael Grady	Conally's-lane	plasterer and stuccoman	same	same	as a plasterer and stuccoman.
Mark Geauy	Mainguard	baker	same	same	as a baker.
Kathery Glynn	West Henry-st.	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
John Grealy	Mainguard	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Bartholomew Gannon	Eye-square	slater	same	same	as a slater.
Edmond Glynn	Barrack-lane	maason	same	same	as a maason.
John Grapa	Neortownsmith	stuccoman	same	same	as a stuccoman.

(continued)

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which admitted.
High Glynn	Kelly's-lane	cooper	18 Sept. 1839	10 Oct. 1839	as a cooper.
Patrick Gibbullen	New-road	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Patrick Griffin	Abbeygate-street	musician	same	same	as a musician.
Patrick Hughes	William's-gate	millar and master baker.	same	same	as a millar and master baker.
Thomas Halloran	Gray-street	rope-manufacturer	same	same	as a rope-manufacturer.
James Holland	Mry's-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Patrick Halloran	Merchants'-road	pilot and trader	same	same	as a pilot and trader.
John Horrigan	Bowling-green	tanner	same	same	as a tanner.
James Hynes	Shop-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
John Holland	Eyre-street	master tailor	same	same	as a master tailor.
William Hoagh	Eyre-street	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Dominick Hynes, jun.	Henry-street	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Edmond Hynes	same	same	same	same	same.
Matthew Hurd	Abbeygate-street	cabinet-maker	same	same	as a cabinet-maker.
Edward Herring	Gray-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Michael Harkins	same	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
John Hetherton	Shop-street	victualler	same	same	as a victualler.
James Hetherton	same	same	same	same	same.
John Holbart	Abbeygate-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Daniel Higgins	William's-gate	merchant	same	same	as a merchant.
Bartholomew Halloran	Chadidagh	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Michael Hall	Long-walk	cookmaker	same	same	as a cookmaker.
Michael Halloran	Abbeygate-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Thomas Hall	Middle-street	same	same	same	same.
Peter Hale	Cross-street	same	same	same	same.
John Hynes	Market-street	smith	same	same	as a smith.
Canon Hogan	Shop-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
David Hogle	Buttermilk-lane	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
James Hoan	Malingard	same	same	same	same.
Dominick Horan	same	same	same	same	same.
Thomas Hynes	Parkavera	threadmaker and dyer.	same	same	as a threadmaker and dyer.
Edmund Hutchison	Kirwan's-lane	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
David Hughes	Market-street	same	same	same	same.
John Hale	Middle-street	same	same	same	same.
William Hart	Eyre-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Michael Horan	Abbeygate-street	same	same	same	same.
Thomas Horan	Eyre-square	same	same	same	same.
Michael Hanly	West-street	same	same	same	same.
Michael Hannan	Middle-street	soy-boiler	same	same	as a soy-boiler.
Martin Hefferan	Ayle Barna	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Patrick Hynes	Lombard-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Tim Hughes	Middle-street	brasser	same	same	as a brasser.
James Halloran	Abbeygate-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Patrick Halloran	Market-street	same	same	same	same.
Dennis Holan	Eyre-street	printer	same	same	as a printer.
Peter Hynes	Market-street	millar	same	same	as a millar.
Thomas Hurry	New-road	papermaker	same	same	as a papermaker.
Andrew Halloran	Cross-street	baker	same	same	as a baker.
Dominick Hynes	Henry-street	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
John Halloran	Flax-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Francois Holland	Shop-street	trader and dealer	same	same	as a trader and dealer.
James Hosnick	Eyre-street	brewer	same	same	as a brewer.
Johanna Ireland	Eyre-square	merchant	same	same	as a merchant.
Arthur Ireland	same	same	same	same	same.
Patrick Joyce	Dominick-street	ship-builder	same	same	as a ship-builder.
Andrew Johnson	Bridge-street	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
John Joyce	Dominick-street	ship-carpenter	same	same	as a ship-carpenter.
Peter Joyce	Presencione-road	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Thomas Johnson	Bridge-street	same	same	same	same.
James Joyce	Eyre-square	distiller	same	same	as a distiller.
Richard Joyce	Newtownsmith	same	same	same	same.
Patrick Joyce	same	same	same	same	same.
Martin Kearney	Market-street	corn-merchant and dealer.	same	same	as a corn-chandler & merchant.
Patrick Kelly	Shop-street	merchant & trader	same	same	as a merchant and trader.
Martin Kinrossy	William-street	same	same	same	same.
Patrick Kilkenny	same	same	same	same	same.
John Kihoy	McCarthy-square	trader	same	same	as a trader.
Michael Kihoy	same	surg. & apothecary	same	same	as a surgeon and apothecary.
John Keating	Bowling-green	carrier	same	same	as a carrier.
James Kaine	Mye-hush	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Michael Kelly	High-street	master tailor	same	same	as a master tailor.
Edward Killen	Up. Dominick-st.	merchant	same	same	as a merchant.
Michael Killen	High-street	same	same	same	same.
Patrick Kirby	Up. Dominick-st.	millar	same	same	as a millar.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[83]

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Signet under which admitted.
John Kelly	Cross-street	painter	18 Sept. 1882	10 Oct. 1882	as a painter.
Patrick Kelly	same	same	1882	1882	same.
James Kain	Nans' Island	millwright	1882	1882	as a millwright.
Francis Kiggins	Middle-street	cooper	1882	1882	as a cooper.
William Keating	Abbeygate-street	shoemaker	1882	1882	as a shoemaker.
Michael Kelly	Buttermilk-lane	tailor	1882	1882	as a tailor.
Thomas King	Henry-street	shoemaker	1882	1882	as a shoemaker.
John King	Hanbury's-lane	same	1882	1882	same.
John Kain	Leahard-street	same	1882	1882	same.
Edmond Kelly	Wood-quay	tailor	1882	1882	tailor.
Bartholomew Kelly	Eyre-street	mason	1882	1882	as a mason.
Nicholas Kenny	Dominick-street	chandler	1882	1882	as a chandler.
Patrick Kiffin	Abbeygate-street	mason	1882	1882	as a mason.
Martin Kenny	Henry-street	shoemaker	1882	1882	as a shoemaker.
Francis Kenny	Abbeygate-street	victualler	1882	1882	as a victualler.
John Kibby	Kirwan's-lane	shoemaker	1882	1882	as a shoemaker.
James Kain	Upper Henry-st.	carpenter	1882	1882	as a carpenter.
Geo. Kennedy	Bohemore	weaver	1882	1882	as a weaver.
Mark Kirwan	Upp. Dominick-st.	same	1882	1882	same.
Thomas Kain	same	clotier	1882	1882	as a clotier.
Stephen Kiggins	Kirwan's-lane	cooper	1882	1882	as a cooper.
John Kerrigan	New-road	brogue-maker	1882	1882	as a brogue-maker.
Thomas Kelly Francis	Buttermilk-lane	carpenter	1882	1882	as a carpenter.
John Kilgarriff	Market-street	tallow-chandler	1882	1882	as a tallow-chandler.
Michael Keady	Henry-street	carpenter	1882	1882	as a carpenter.
John Kelly	Buttermilk-lane	printer	1882	1882	as a printer.
Francis Kain	Courthouse-lane	shoemaker	1882	1882	as a shoemaker.
Peter Keating	Bohemore	same	1882	1882	same.
Peter Keogh	Green	tailor	1882	1882	as a tailor.
James Kain	Leahard-street	same	1882	1882	same.
Archibald Keath	same	papermaker	1882	1882	as a papermaker.
Michael Kelly	Merchants'-road	merchant	1882	1882	as a merchant.
Francis Kerrigan	Bridge-street	brushmaker	1882	1882	as a brushmaker.
Peter Kelly	Whitehall-street	painter	1882	1882	as a painter.
John Kelly	College-street	thread-manufact.	1882	1882	as a thread-manufacture.
Edmond Kelly	Cross-street	painter	1882	1882	as a painter.
Thomas Kelly	High-street	tailor	1882	1882	as a tailor.
George Kelly	Shop-street	tailor	1882	1882	as a tailor.
Patrick Keery	Martin's-lane	shoer	1882	1882	as a shoer.
Walter Larkin	Whitehall	shoemaker	1882	1882	as a shoemaker.
Timothy Lyons	Middle-street	blacksmith	1882	1882	as a blacksmith.
Martin Lydon	Henry-street	weaver	1882	1882	as a weaver.
Patrick M. Lynch	Kennore-edge	merchant	1882	1882	as a merchant.
Patrick Lucas	Leahard-street	smith	1882	1882	as a smith.
William Lucas	same	same	1882	1882	same.
Mark Leonard	Eyre-square	tailor	1882	1882	as a tailor.
William Lee	Bohemore	weaver	1882	1882	as a weaver.
Thomas Lolly	Whitehall	slater	1882	1882	as a slater.
Hugh Lynch	Market-street	shoemaker	1882	1882	as a shoemaker.
Thomas Laine	West	carpenter	1882	1882	as a carpenter.
Joseph Leonard	Market-street	stonecutter	1882	1882	as a stonecutter.
Edmond Lee	Henry-street	shoemaker	1882	1882	as a shoemaker.
Michael Lawrence	Upp. Dominick-st.	same	1882	1882	same.
Thomas Lee	same	same	1882	1882	same.
John Longa	Kelly's-lane	weaver	1882	1882	as a weaver.
Patrick Lavery	Church-yard	shoemaker	1882	1882	as a shoemaker.
Thomas Long	Barra	tailor	1882	1882	as a tailor.
Richard M. Lynch	Brook-street	merchant	1882	1882	as a merchant.
Daniel Lydon	Kirwan's-lane	baker	1882	1882	as a baker.
Thomas Lydon	William-street	same	1882	1882	same.
William Lardner	College-road	stonemason	1882	1882	as a stonemason.
Edmond Leonard	Noyan's-lane	shoemaker	1882	1882	as a shoemaker.
Mathew Lynch	Parkovera	ship-carpenter	1882	1882	as a ship-carpenter.
Louise Lardner	College-road	stonecutter	1882	1882	as a stonecutter.
Martin Lane	Presentation-road	carpenter	1882	1882	as a carpenter.
Robert Langford	Nans' Island	brewer	1882	1882	as a brewer.
Roger Lynskey	Bohemore	ropemaker	1882	1882	as a ropemaker.
George Lackey	Chaidigh	same	1882	1882	same.
James Lee	Leag-road	victualler	1882	1882	as a victualler.
Thomas Logan	Hanbury's-lane	brushmaker	1882	1882	as a brushmaker.
Andy Lydon	Boherbeg	ropemaker	1882	1882	as a ropemaker.
James Loftus	Bohemore	brogue-maker	1882	1882	as a brogue-maker.
Edmond Loftus	same	same	1882	1882	same.
William Lakey	Quay	ropemaker	1882	1882	as a ropemaker.
Michael Meehan	Abbeygate-street	cabinet-maker	1882	1882	as a cabinet-maker.
Richard Malowry	College-road	bellinger	1882	1882	as a bellinger.
John Marden	Back-street	shoemaker	1882	1882	as a shoemaker.

(continued)

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Absence.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which admitted.
John M'Donnell	Abbeygate-street	shoemaker	18 Sept. 1833	10 Oct. 1832	as a shoemaker.
Andrew M'Connell	Bridge-street	same	same	same	same.
Patrick Mayley	Kelly's-lane	turner	same	same	as a turner.
Edmond Maher	Lombard-street	carrier	same	same	as a carrier.
Thomas Murphy	Shoaken	turner	same	same	as a turner.
Samuel Montgomery	Claddagh	ropemaker	same	same	as a ropemaker.
John Mullin	same	shipwright	same	same	as a shipwright.
Michael M'Donnell	Abbeygate-street	shopkeeper	same	same	as a shopkeeper.
Patrick M'Nery	College-road	blacksmith	same	same	as a blacksmith.
James Murphy	Moyrick-square	victualler	same	same	as a victualler.
James M'Namara	Bohemore	same	same	same	same.
Thomas Murray	Costello's-lane	stonemason	same	same	as a stonemason.
Daniel Miller	Market-street	cabinet-maker	same	same	as a cabinet-maker.
Owen Mara	Bowling-green	stonemason	same	same	as a stonemason.
Redmond Murray	Green	same	same	same	same.
Patrick Mullin	Boherbeg	victualler	same	same	as a victualler.
Michael M'Anly	same	same	same	same	same.
Dominick M'Hugo	Abbey-street	cabinet-maker	same	same	as a cabinet-maker.
Michael Morris, sen.	Shop-street	slater	same	same	as a slater.
Michael Morris, jun.	Kirwan's-lane	same	same	same	same.
Walter M'Hugh	Market-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Alexander M'Leane	Lombard-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Mahias M'Donogh	Barna	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Patrick M'Anley	Abbeygate-street	coppersmith	same	same	as a coppersmith.
Patrick Munnion	Bohemore	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Thomas M'orney	Martin's-lane	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Peter M'ulloway	Claddagh	victualler	same	same	as a victualler.
John M'Loughlin	Market-street	slater	same	same	as a slater.
John M'annon	Buttermilk-lane	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Michael Maher	Prospect-hill	same	same	same	same.
Anthony Morris	Buttermilk-lane	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
James M'Hugo	Abbeygate-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
John M'Treen	Dominick-street	leather-cutter	same	same	as a leather-cutter.
Michael M'ossey	Cross-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Owen M'Donnell	Merchants'-road	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Varey M'Carroll	Bohemore	stone-cutter	same	same	as a stone-cutter.
Patrick M'Hugh	Cusack-lane	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Thomas M'Williams	College-road	stonemason	same	same	as a stonemason.
Thomas M'Gann	Bohemore	victualler	same	same	as a victualler.
Alexander M'Connell	Quay-street	sailmaker	same	same	as a sailmaker.
Andrew Moran	Church-lane	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
John Murphy	Abbeygate-street	shopkeeper	same	same	as shopkeeper.
Robert Miller	Presentation-road	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Richard Malley	Upp. Dominick-st.	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Patrick M'ulloway	Eye-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
John Madden	Quay-street	cabinet-maker	same	same	as a cabinet-maker.
Richard M'Hugo	Upp. Dominick-st.	miller	same	same	as a miller.
Denis M'Nery	Bohemore	mason	same	same	as a mason.
Thomas M'ard	Abbeygate-street	baker	same	same	as a baker.
John M'Hugo	same	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Thomas Morgan	Henry-street	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Bartholomew Mahony	Shop-street	baker	same	same	as a baker.
Michael M'Donnell	Abbeygate-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
James M'Donnell	Merchants'-road	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Timothy M'Donogh	Barrack-lane	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
John M'Donnell	Abbeygate-street	barber	same	same	as a barber.
Denis Munnion	Shop-street	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
James M'Donogh	Dominick-street	broguesmaker	same	same	as a broguesmaker.
Terence M'Dermott	Cross-street	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Michael M'ulloway	Whitehall	turner	same	same	as a turner.
Edward M'Donogh	Upp. Dominick-st.	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
John Martin	Middle-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Hugh M'Donnell	Lombard-street	same	same	same	same.
David M'urden	Back-street	same	same	same	same.
Thomas Murray	Cross-street	chandler	same	same	as a chandler.
James Mullin	Boherbeg	victualler	same	same	as a victualler.
John M'Donogh	Presbyterian	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Patrick M'Hugh	Kelly's-lane	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Richard M'Hugh	Market-street	same	same	same	same.
James M'Nerby	Bridge-street	victualler	same	same	as a victualler.
Thomas Mahon	Kirwan's-lane	pvicour	same	same	as a pvicour.
Andrew M'Figue	Bohemore	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
John Mooney	Buttermilk-lane	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Patrick M'Hugo	same	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Martin M'Enerny	Tromble-ditch	smith	same	same	as a smith.
William M'Namara	New-road	victualler	same	same	as a victualler.
Edward Madden	Maitland	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which admitted.
Thomas McNamara	Presentation-road	victualler	18 Sept. 1892	10 Oct. 1892	as a victualler.
Patrick John Morris	Newtownsmith	distiller	same	same	as a distiller.
William McAuley	Henry-street	butcher	same	same	as a butcher.
Thomas Maxwell	Abbeygate-street	nailer	same	same	as a nailer.
John Mcintosh	Market-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Michael Mullen	Barna	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Frederick McDonogh	Mainguard	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Patrick Marston	Eyre-square	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Patrick McGinn	Lombard-street	same	same	same	same.
Lawrence McHale	same	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Thomas Maguire	William-street	trader	same	same	as a trader.
Andrew McNamara	Eyre-square	same	same	same	same.
Martin McCordick	West William-st.	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Patrick McDonogh	Barna	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Myles McDonogh	Quay-street	same	same	same	same.
R. P. McDonnell	Dominick-street	builder	same	same	as a builder.
Michael Murray	William-street	tobacco-spinner	same	same	as a tobacco-spinner.
Bury McNatty	Bridge	butcher	same	same	as a butcher.
Thomas Melloy	Bohemians	mason	same	same	as a mason.
James Murray	Tullibeg	slater	same	same	as a slater.
Thomas Millin	Parkavera	shipwright	same	same	as a shipwright.
Richard Naregton	Merchants'-road	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Thomas Neven	Shin-street	cabinet-maker	same	same	as a cabinet-maker.
John Nally	same	sawyer	same	same	as a sawyer.
Patrick Needham	Market-street	nailer	same	same	as a nailer.
Timothy Nugent	Lombard-street	mason	same	same	as a mason.
William Nolan	New-road	sawyer	same	same	as a sawyer.
Michael Nolan	Abbeygate-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Patrick Nugent	Lombard-street	stone-cutter	same	same	as a stone-cutter.
William Nolan	Churchyard	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Patrick Nolan	Buttermilk-lane	sawyer	same	same	as a sawyer.
John Newell	Henry-street West	stone-mason	same	same	as a stone-mason.
Patrick Nicholas	Bohemians	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
John Nevin	Mainguard-street	hatter	same	same	as a hatter.
Patrick Nevill	Beighle-street	chandlier	same	same	as a chandlier.
Patrick Nolin	Abbeygate-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Timothy Novel	Moyrick-square	smith	same	same	as a smith.
Cornelius O'Neill	Bowling-green	leather-drapery	same	same	as a leather-drapery.
Thomas O'Donnell	Upp. Dominick-st.	tanner	same	same	as a tanner.
John O'Shaughnessy	Collage-road	mason	same	same	as a mason.
James Robt. O'Flaherty	High-street	merchant	same	same	as a merchant.
Patrick O'Neill	West William-st.	peviour	same	same	as a peviour.
John O'Neill	same	same	same	same	same.
John O'Neill, jun.	same	same	same	same	same.
Berkalmon O'Siver	Quay-street	trader	same	same	as a trader.
James O'Connor	Church-lane	cabinet-maker	same	same	as a cabinet-maker.
Maria O'Maley	Mary-street	smith	same	same	as a smith.
John O'Connor	Quay-street	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
James O'Connor	Tullibeg	same	same	same	same.
Patrick O'Brien	West-street	same	same	same	same.
Denis O'Sullivan	Eyre-square	ropemaker	same	same	as a ropemaker.
John O'Sullivan	same	same	same	same	same.
Thomas O'Sullivan	same	same	same	same	same.
Robert O'Donnell	William's-gate	tallow-chandler	same	same	as a tallow-chandler.
Denis O'Sullivan	Merchants'-road	rope-maker	same	same	as a ropemaker.
Peter O'Malley	Barna	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
John O'Flaherty	New-road	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Dominick O'Madden	Merchants' road	architect	same	same	as an architect.
Robert Pilkington	Eyre-street	printer	same	same	as a printer.
John Pinnac	Abbeygate-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Henry Piskey	Henry-street	same	same	same	same.
Thomas Purcell	West	dyer	same	same	as a dyer.
Francis Purros	Mary-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
John Piaras	Kelly's-lane	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Thomas Power	Collage-road	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Stephen Pidgen	Shop-street	cloth-merchant	same	same	as a cloth-merchant.
Patrick Prendergast	Lang-walk	ropemaker	same	same	as a ropemaker.
James Prendergast	Bohemians	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
James Purson	Kelly's-lane	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
George Packer	Bohemians	nailer	same	same	as a nailer.
Edward Power	Abbeygate-street	skinner	same	same	as a skinner.
Garret Pinea	Claddagh	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
James Parlor	same	ropemaker	same	same	as a ropemaker.
James Quinan	Parkavera	blacksmith	same	same	as a blacksmith.
Patrick Ryan	New-road	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Michael Rathery	Mainguard-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Andrew Rochford	Middle-street	sawyer	same	same	as a sawyer.

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Rights under which admitted.
John Reddington	Abbeygate-street	shoemaker	16 Sept. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	as a shoemaker.
Patrick Reddington	Church-yard	whitesmith	1832	1832	as a whitesmith.
Patrick Reddington	Abbeygate-street	shoemaker	1832	1832	as a shoemaker.
Martha Redington	same	same	1832	1832	same.
John Rieker	Eyre-square	ironer	1832	1832	as a ironer.
Thomas Roche	Newcastle	carpenter	1832	1832	as a carpenter.
Thomas Redington	Abbeygate-street	shoemaker	1832	1832	as a shoemaker.
James Redington	same	same	1832	1832	same.
George Rochfort	New-road	sawyer	1832	1832	as a sawyer.
Henry Rochfort	Church-yard	shoemaker	1832	1832	as a shoemaker.
Michael Rochfort	same	same	1832	1832	same.
Peter Ryan	Gibraltar-lane	carpenter	1832	1832	as a carpenter.
Patrick Roche	Eyre-square	tailor	1832	1832	as a tailor.
James Richardson	Bohemian	tailor	1832	1832	as a tailor.
William Ryan	Mungard	hatter	1832	1832	as a hatter.
Patrick Roark	William-street	victualler	1832	1832	as a victualler.
Andrew Rogan	Middle-street	same	1832	1832	same.
Mark Rowlin	Bohemian	confectioner	1832	1832	as a confectioner.
Thomas Reap	Nass' Island	baker	1832	1832	as a baker.
Anthony Ballys	Morelands'-road	cooper	1832	1832	as a cooper.
James Rafferty	Courthouse-lane	shoemaker	1832	1832	as a shoemaker.
Michael Reas	Parkavera	same	1832	1832	same.
John Rancey	Eyre-street	stocking-maker	1832	1832	as a stocking-maker.
John Ryan	Raboon	wearer	1832	1832	as a wearer.
Wm. White Robinson	Eyre-square	watchmaker	1832	1832	as a watchmaker.
Patrick Ryan	Newcastle	wearer	1832	1832	as a wearer.
Paul Radier	Castellon-lane	ironer	1832	1832	as a ironer.
John Sullivan	Mungard-street	victualler	1832	1832	as a victualler.
Martin Stannion	Kelly's-lane	brogue-maker	1832	1832	as a brogue-maker.
Michael Stannion	same	same	1832	1832	same.
Michael Starkey	Courthouse-lane	clothes	1832	1832	as a clothes.
Walter Stannion	Mungard-street	ship-carpenter	1832	1832	as a ship-carpenter.
Denis Sullivan	Lough-street	victualler	1832	1832	as a victualler.
Thomas Shea	Upp. Dominick-st.	milker	1832	1832	as a milker.
Lawrence Seahill	Bowling-green	slater	1832	1832	as a slater.
Patrick Sheehy	Eyre-square	carpenter	1832	1832	as a carpenter.
Thomas Sullivan	Upp. Dominick-st.	tailor	1832	1832	as a tailor.
Thomas Starkey	Shop-street	whitesmith	1832	1832	as a whitesmith.
James Sweeny	Henry-street	wheelwright	1832	1832	as a wheelwright.
Andrew Simple	Nass' Island	carpenter	1832	1832	as a carpenter.
Michael Simple	same	same	1832	1832	same.
William Sullivan	Market-street	shoemaker	1832	1832	as a shoemaker.
James Sweeney	Cross-street	vintner	1832	1832	as a vintner.
Patrick Stannion	Shop-street	shipwright	1832	1832	as a shipwright.
David Smyth	Mungard-street	hatter	1832	1832	as a hatter.
Edmond Shea	Bowling-green	carrier	1832	1832	as a carrier.
Dudley Seaman	Presentation-st.	turner	1832	1832	as a turner.
Peter Sullivan	Henry-street	wearer	1832	1832	as a wearer.
Richard Swan	Upp. Dominick-st.	tailor	1832	1832	as a tailor.
John Scott	William-street	ironer	1832	1832	as a ironer.
John Shaw	Baldy-lane	cabinet-maker	1832	1832	as a cabinet-maker.
James Shaw	same	same	1832	1832	same.
Jess. Shaw	same	same	1832	1832	same.
Andrew Sexton	Lombard-street	slater	1832	1832	as a slater.
Robert Stephens	Nass' Island	brewer	1832	1832	as a brewer.
Edmond Spelman	Upp. Dominick-st.	carpenter	1832	1832	as a carpenter.
John Sullivan	Shop-street	wearer	1832	1832	as a wearer.
Charles Smith	Church-lane	tailor	1832	1832	as a tailor.
John Shea	Lombard-street	tailor	1832	1832	as a tailor.
John Skerret	Buttermilk-lane	sawyer	1832	1832	as a sawyer.
Patrick Sullivan	Presentation-road	victualler	1832	1832	as a victualler.
Cornelius Sullivan	Middle-street	same	1832	1832	same.
John Sexton	Parkavera	papermaker	1832	1832	as a papermaker.
Stephen Sullivan	Bridge-street	victualler	1832	1832	as a victualler.
Michael Sexton	New-road	papermaker	1832	1832	as a papermaker.
Samuel Sexton	Parkavera	same	1832	1832	same.
Thomas Scanlon	Chadleigh	ropemaker	1832	1832	as a ropemaker.
Henry Scott	Dominick-street	chandler	1832	1832	as a chandler.
William Simple	New-road	carpenter	1832	1832	as a carpenter.
Mathew Simple	same	same	1832	1832	same.
Patrick Sergant	Shop-street	tailor	1832	1832	as a tailor.
James Sergant	same	same	1832	1832	same.
Edward Sexton	Lombard-street	shoemaker	1832	1832	as a shoemaker.
Patrick Sergant	Shop-street	tailor	1832	1832	as a tailor.
Henry Simons	New-road	sawyer	1832	1832	as a sawyer.
Cornelius Shea	Lombard-street	tailor	1832	1832	as a tailor.
William B. Stephens	Newcastle	brewer	1832	1832	as a brewer.

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which admitted.
Martin Turvey	Cliddagh	shipwright	18 Sept. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	as a shipwright.
Andrew Turvey	same	same	same	same	same.
Andrew Treacy	Bowling-green	painter	same	same	as a painter.
William Treacy, jun.	same	same	same	same	same.
Martin Turvey	Middle-street	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Patrick Tanslea	Upp. Dominick-st.	barber	same	same	as a barber.
Matthew Toole	Quay-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Patrick Toole	Nans' Island	same	same	same	same.
William Turtum	Cross-street	same	same	same	same.
Thomas Turvey	same	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Thomas Toole	same	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Henry Townsend	Quay	merchant	same	same	as a merchant.
Luke Tarrant	same	baker	same	same	as a baker.
John Tysoil	Quay	milner	same	same	as a milner.
Peter Toole	Presentation-road	papermaker	same	same	as a papermaker.
Martin Turvey	Cliddagh	shipwright	same	same	as a shipwright.
Michael Trarvia	William-street	railer	same	same	as a railer.
James Toole	Shop-street	brewer	same	same	as a brewer.
John Vaughan	Bridge-street	painter	same	same	as a painter.
William Vaughan	same	same	same	same	same.
John Vaughan	Beharmore	victualler	same	same	as a victualler.
John White	same	cooper	same	same	as a cooper.
Patrick Ward	same	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
Michael Walsh	same	brogusmaker	same	same	as a brogusmaker.
Martin Wade	same	blacksmith	same	same	as a blacksmith.
Martin Wade, jun.	same	same	same	same	same.
Michael White	same	brogusmaker	same	same	as a brogusmaker.
Patrick Walsh	New-road	cabinet-maker	same	same	as a cabinet-maker.
Bertholmeaw Walsh	High-street	slater	same	same	as a slater.
John Walsh	William-street	mason	same	same	as a mason.
Ulick Walsh	same	vintner & shopk.	same	same	as a vintner.
Michael Walsh Peter	same	victualler	same	same	as a victualler.
Tandy Wade	Beharmore	blacksmith	same	same	as a blacksmith.
Thomas Walsh	Kierwan's-lane	mason	same	same	as a mason.
Stephen Walsh	Martin's-entry	victualler	same	same	as a victualler.
Patrick Walsh	Henry-street	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
William Wallace	Lombard-street	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
William Walsh	Abbeygate-street	saddler	same	same	as a saddler.
Darby Ward	William-street	chandler	same	same	as a chandler.
Martin Walsh	West Long-road	weaver	same	same	as a weaver.
Edmond Weldon	Nans' Island	smith	same	same	as a smith.
John Weldon	same	same	same	same	same.
Paul Williams	Loxward-street	carpenter	same	same	as a carpenter.
John Williams	same	same	same	same	same.
John Walsh	William's-gate	mason	same	same	as a mason.
David Walsh	Burns	same	same	same	same.
William Wallace	Presentation-road	shoemaker	same	same	as a shoemaker.
Thomas Wall	Shop-street	barber	same	same	as a barber.
Robin Wilby	Revenue-road	tailor	same	same	as a tailor.
Patrick Ward	New-road	milner	same	same	as a milner.
Christopher York	Long-walk	stonecutter	same	same	as a stonecutter.
Gregory York	same	same	same	same	same.

John M. O'Hara,
Acting Town Clerk.

4 March 1837.

LIMERICK.

Geo. M. J. Drought, esq.	then in Limerick	chief mag. police	9 April 1831	-	by special favour.
Joseph Gabban, esq.	Limerick	esquire	29 ditto	-	birth.
Thomas Willis, esq.	same	same	22 Sept. 1831	27 Oct. 1832	same.
Thomas Ebril	same	sergeant-at-mace	11 Nov. 1831	30 - - -	favour.
Benjamin Cox	same	esquire	16 Jan. 1832	-	marriage.
John Meehan	same	cooper	4 April 1832	-	same.
Richard C. Langford	same	esquire	5 July 1832	24 Oct. 1832	favour.
James Butler Boyd	same	merchant	7 ditto	31 - - -	marriage.
Joseph Dickson Brazzill	same	esquire	18 Sept. 1832	15 - - -	birth.
John S. Brown	Mount Brown, Co. Limerick	same	10 ditto	-	same.
James O'Mahon	Limerick	attorney	15 ditto	24 Oct. 1832	same.
Edph Wilson	same	cordwainer	ditto	31 - - -	marriage.
Charles Stuart	same	gentleman	4 Oct. 1832	7 Nov. 1832	birth.
Wm. Arthur Gibson	same	esquire	8 ditto	20 Oct. 1832	same.
Ann Treher	same	esq. n. n.	1 ditto	7 Nov. 1832	favour.
Henry Hesseck	same	esquire	18 ditto	-	birth.

(continued.)

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which admitted.
Christopher Adamson, jun.	Kittaneigh, County Limerick.	esquire	13 Oct. 1832	21 Oct. 1832	birth.
John W. Mahony	Richmond Liberty, Limerick.	same	same	15 — —	ditto.
Francis Wilkinson	Limerick	same	same	1 Nov. 1832	favour.
Pierce L. Garton	same	music-master	1 Nov. 1832	2 — —	birth.
Henry Versker	same	esquire	0 — —	6 — —	favour.
John Versker, jun.	same	same	0 — —	2 — —	ditto.
Richard Wallace	same	silversmith	7 — —	7 — —	marriage.
Robert Bull	same	condemner	8 — —	8 — —	birth.
Charles Versker	same	corp. front. 27th foot	8 — —	8 — —	favour.
Philip McAdam	Spelaghill, County Clare.	esquire	9 — —	10 — —	birth.
Edmd. Wm. Rudedge	Limerick	gentleman	10 — —	10 — —	ditto.
Eyre Smyth	Corbally Liberties	late lieutenant-colonel 62d regiment.	7 Jan. 1833.	3 Jan. 1833	favour.
Timothy O'Brien	Killouan	esquire	17 April 1832	— — —	marriage.
Thomas Wm. Mossell	Limerick	attorney	8 Oct. 1832	23 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Richard Franklin	same	surgeon	17 — —	— — —	favour.
Richard Kenny	same	esquire	22 — —	— — —	ditto.
John Gleeson	same	solicitor	8 Jan. 1834	7 April 1835	marriage.
Andrew Carvell	same	esquire	9 — —	7 — —	birth.
Richard B. Corneale	same	gentleman	24 April 1834	6 Jan. 1835	ditto.
Christopher Carr	same	same	2 Oct. 1834	5 — —	marriage.
George Farnell	same	esquire	11 — —	5 — —	ditto.
Thomas E. Carty	same	attorney	21 — —	31 Oct. 1834	ditto.
Godfrey Bevan	same	same	22 Dec. 1834	5 Jan. 1835	ditto.
Edward Waller Pas	same	esquire	22 — —	6 — —	birth.
Croker Barrington	same	same	9 Jan. 1835	26 Oct. 1835	ditto.
Thomas Gabbett	Corbally	same	12 — —	7 April 1835	ditto.
Charles Hogan	Limerick	gentleman	25 Mar. 1835	7 — —	ditto.
John Luns	same	same	25 — —	7 — —	ditto.
Gaualid M. Fitzgerald	same	esquire	8 April 1835	7 — —	ditto.
William O'Farrell	same	architect	25 June 1835	28 Oct. 1835	favour.
George Stoddert	same	esquire	25 — —	7 April 1835	marriage.
Edward Parker, jun.	same	same	3 Oct. 1835	30 Oct. 1835	birth.
James Barnatyne	same	same	10 — —	— — —	marriage.
William Watson	same	esq., royal navy	16 — —	28 Oct. 1835	ditto.
James Wm. McGrath	same	gentleman	28 — —	26 Oct. 1835	birth.
Bernard O'Farrell	same	architect	24 — —	30 — —	ditto.
Joseph Evans	same	esquire	7 Nov. 1835	— — —	ditto.
John Sheehy	same	solicitor	16 Sept. 1836	24 Oct. 1836	marriage.
George Burslem	same	esquire	11 Oct. 1836	— — —	ditto.
Samuel Binton, jun.	same	same	15 — —	— — —	birth.
Richard Parsons	same	same	13 Mar. 1837	— — —	marriage.

(Examined)

Edward Parker, Town-clerk.

J. Versker, Mayor.

LONDONDERRY.

Samuel Alexander	Londonderry	merchant	21 May 1831	1 — 1838 registered as householder	admitted a freeman by special favour.
William Boggs	same	same	same	2 Nov. 1832 as householder	like.
William H. Buchanan	same	printer	3 Sept. 1832	3 Nov. 1832	servitude.
Sir Robert Bateson	Balvoir Park	herr.	3 May 1832	— — —	special favour.
Thomas Barr	Londonderry	weaver	4 May 1831	3 Nov. 1832	servitude.
Rt. Hon. Sir John Byng	London	—	12 Aug. 1831	— — —	special favour.
William Colbourn	Londonderry	rope-maker	4 May 1831	8 Nov. 1832	servitude.
Richard, Lord Bishop of Londonderry.	same	—	12 Nov. 1831	— — —	special favour.
Alexander Dyers	same	merchant	4 May 1831	— — —	like.
John Dougherty	same	shoemaker	3 Sept. 1832	8 Nov. 1832	servitude.
Hugh Gill	same	rope-maker	same	7 — —	like.
William Glenn	same	same	same	8 — —	like.
John Henderson	same	lieut., royal navy	4 May 1831	— — —	special favour.
William Irvine	same	rope-maker	same	7 Nov. 1832	servitude.
John Jamieson	same	shoemaker	3 Sept. 1832	5 — —	like.
T. Jones	London	capt., royal navy	3 May 1832	— — —	special favour.
John Keenan	Londonderry	rope-spinner	4 May 1831	7 Nov. 1832	servitude.
William King	same	merchant	21 May 1831	— — —	special favour.
Alexander Kyle	same	shopkeeper	3 Sept. 1832	8 Nov. 1832	servitude.
Rt. Hon. Lord Lyndhurst.	London	—	2 Nov. 1836	— — —	special favour.

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which admitted.
John Munn	Londonderry	merchant	21 May 1831	6 Nov. 1832 as householders	special favour.
Richard Maxwell	Biristown	esquire	7 Oct. 1831	-	like.
Robert W. Maxwell	same	same	-	-	like.
William McClelland	Lurgmoont	same	7 April 1831	-	special favour
John Mitchell McClelland	same	same	-	-	like.
Thomas McClelland	same	same	-	-	like.
Leslie Patterson	Mason-lodge	same	-	-	birth.
David Porter	Londonderry	merchant	21 May 1831	6 Nov. 1832 as householders	special favour.
Henril Smyth	Ardmore	esquire	12 April 1831	-	like.
John Smyth	same	same	-	-	like.
William Dymot Smyth	same	same	-	-	like.
Rev. Mitchell Smyth	same	clerk	-	-	like.
William Murphy	Londonderry	tailer	8 Sept. 1832	6 Nov. 1833	servitude.
James Smyth	same	attorney	-	-	like.
James Tynes	same	tailer	-	-	like.
Samuel Law Crawford	same	attorney	31 Dec. 1835	-	like.
John Buchanan	same	printer	-	-	like.
Robert Nugent	same	plasterer	-	-	like.
James Nicholl	same	rope-maker	-	-	like.
David Gailey	same	sail-maker	-	-	like.
David Jameson	same	shoemaker	-	-	like.
James Shannon	same	painter	-	-	like.
David Haslett	same	merchant	-	-	like.
John Doherty	same	attorney	-	-	like.
William McCandless	same	leather-cutter	-	-	like.
James McCandless	same	same	-	-	like.

Thomas P. Kennedy, Mayor.

WATERFORD.

Aylward, John Joseph	Waterford	merchant	20 Sept. 1835	16 Oct. 1835	admitted in right of birth.
Archdall, Rev. Wm. K.	Kilnashoda, in the county of	clerks	2 Oct. 1835	- same -	ditto.
Archdall, Rev. Charles	Waterford	-	-	-	-
Adams, Patrick	Waterford	shoemaker	6 Oct. 1832	- same -	ditto.
Adams, William	same	gentleman	29 Dec. 1834	Jan. sess. 1835	ditto, apprenticeship.
Allen, Boyd	same	sail-maker	23 Mar. 1835	3 Apr. sess. 1835	ditto in right of birth.
Alcock, William Marrie	same	esquire	21 June 1835	25 June 1835	ditto.
Baclos, Robert	Bridestown	same	19 April 1831	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Buckman, Samuel R.	Waterford	gentleman	30 June 1832	did not register	ditto.
Barrow, Wm. Newport	same	esquire	27 Aug. 1835	16 Oct. 1835	ditto.
Bald, Richard	same	cooper	15 Sept. 1835	- same -	ditto.
Bald, James	same	same	-	-	ditto.
Bald, Tobias	same	same	-	-	ditto.
Beverden, William	same	printer	-	-	ditto.
Bergess, William	same	millster	-	-	ditto.
Bergess, John	same	shipwright	-	-	ditto.
Biko, Thomas	same	builder	-	-	ditto.
Biko, John	same	same	-	-	ditto.
Barrow, Pierce George	Tramore	esquire	-	-	ditto in right of marriage.
Bald, Benjamin	Waterford	merchant	20 Sept. 1835	- same -	ditto.
Bellard, Thomas	same	master mariner	-	not registered	ditto in right of birth.
Brewarigg, George	same	esquire	-	-	ditto.
Budd, James	same	shoemaker	-	16 Oct. 1835	ditto in right of marriage.
Brammer, Robert	same	merchant	-	-	ditto in right of birth.
Berkman, John C.	East Passage	esquire	9 Oct. 1832	Mar. sess. 1835	ditto.
Buckas, George	Waterford	same	-	16 Oct. 1835	ditto.
Bryce, Thomas	same	shoemaker	-	-	ditto.
Burke, Thomas	same	cooper	-	-	ditto in right of marriage.
Burgess, Edward	same	servant	-	-	ditto.
Bryce, Terence	same	-	-	-	-
Bryce, Peter	same	slaters	-	-	ditto in right of birth.
Bowman, Samuel E.	same	-	-	-	-
Bowman, James L.	same	cabinet-makers	6 Oct. 1835	- same -	ditto.
Bennett, Thomas	same	shoemaker	-	-	ditto.

(continued)

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Day in order which admitted.
Budd, William	Passage	gentleman	8 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	admitted in right of birth.
Brown, Robert	Waterford	smith	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Batts, William	same	shoemaker	10 June 1833	June sess. 1833	ditto.
Burke Thomas	same	gentleman	- same -	- same -	ditto in right of marriage.
Batts, James	same	shoemaker	9 Oct. 1834	Oct. sess. 1834	ditto in right of birth.
Bennett, William	same	same	29 Dec. 1834	Jan. sess. 1835	ditto.
Burke, Bartholomew	same	gentleman	- same -	- same -	ditto in right of marriage.
Beckes, John	same	painter	25 June 1835	26 June 1835	ditto in right of birth.
Barson, Pierre N.	same	esquire	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Browning, Henry	same	master cooper	- same -	9 Oct. 1835	ditto.
Bourke, Richard	Kilmoree	esquire	29 Mar. 1836	4 April 1836	ditto.
Baycroft, Joseph J.	Waterford	gentleman	20 June 1836	22 June 1836	ditto.
Bourke, John	Kilmoree	esquire	17 Oct. 1836	not registered	ditto.
Barker, James Wm.	Waterford	gentleman	- same -	29 Dec. 1836	ditto.
Barson Walter	same	solicitor	- same -	not registered as a freeman.	ditto in right of marriage.
Carew, Robert Thomas	Ballinacorney	esquire	29 June 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto in right of birth.
Cronyn, Rev. Edmund	Waterford	clerk	27 Aug. 1832	- same -	ditto in right of marriage.
Curtis, Thomas	same	gentleman	15 Sept. 1832	- same -	ditto in right of birth.
Carroll, John	same	wine-merchant	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Cherry, Thomas R.	same	merchant	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Cherry, William	same	same	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Collins, Benjamin	same	writing-clerk	- same -	- same -	ditto in right of marriage.
Cowan, William	same	gentleman	20 Sept. 1832	- same -	ditto in right of birth.
Chambers, Robert	same	writing-clerk	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Chambers, Robert	same	shoemaker	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Carroll, Nicholas	Coolcogan	gentleman	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Carroll, John, jun.	Waterford	gentleman	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Carroll, Matthew		iron-founder	3 Oct. 1833	- same -	ditto, apprenticeship.
Coery, James	same	shoemaker	0 Oct. 1832	- same -	ditto in right of marriage.
Cuffe, Andrew	same	rope-maker	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Crowder, Luke	same	smith	- same -	- same -	ditto in right of birth.
Carew, Edward	same	cooper	- same -	- same -	ditto in right of marriage.
Cole, Thomas Boyse	same	writing-clerk	27 Mar. 1833	Mar. sess. 1833	ditto in right of birth.
Cooney, Thomas	same	shoemaker	10 June 1833	June sess. 1833	ditto.
Chambers, William	same	pump-maker	- same -	- same -	ditto, apprenticeship.
Conroy, James C.	same	esquire	9 Oct. 1834	8 April 1835	ditto in right of birth.
Cogrove, Ambrose	same	same	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Cherry, Francis P.	same	woollen-draper	29 Dec. 1834	- same -	ditto.
Cole, Christopher	same	gentleman	- same -	Jan. sess. 1835	ditto.
Cooney, John	same	tailor	22 Mar. 1835	8 April 1835	ditto.
Doyle, Strangman	same	esquire	29 June 1831	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Deinade, Vernon R.	same	same	20 June 1832	- same -	ditto.
Denry, John Thomas	same	gentleman	18 Sept. 1832	- same -	ditto.
Denry, David	same	same	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Dooley, William	same	shopkeeper	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Dart, Henry	same	pump-maker	- same -	- same -	ditto in right of marriage.
Deckett, Richard	Tramore	esquire	28 Sept. 1833	- same -	ditto in right of birth.
Dillon, Thomas	Waterford	gentleman	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Dart, William		same	same	- same -	- same -
Duffy, Philip	same	rope-maker	2 Oct. 1832	- same -	ditto, apprenticeship.
Draper, William C.	same	gentleman	6 Oct. 1832	- same -	ditto in right of birth.
Devism, Thomas	same	chair-maker	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Devism, Joseph		same	same	- same -	- same -
Dunne, William H.	same	cabinet-maker	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Denyer, George D.	same	shoe-maker	10 June 1833	Jan. sess. 1833	ditto.
Denry, Henry Hall	same	gentleman	7 Oct. 1834	Oct. sess. 1834	ditto.
Doblyn, Michael	Woodlands	esquire	8 Oct. 1835	9 Oct. 1835	ditto.
Doddie, David	Waterford	painter	20 Mar. 1836	22 June 1836	ditto in right of marriage.
Dart, William	same	printer	20 June 1836	- same -	ditto in right of birth.
Devereux, Nicholas	same	gentleman	- same -	- same -	ditto.
English, Richard	Dangan	esquires	6 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
English, John		same	same	- same -	- same -
Egan, Denis B.	Waterford	gentleman	- same -	- same -	ditto, apprenticeship.
Edwards, Eaton, jun.	Tramore	esquires	- same -	- same -	ditto in right of birth.
Edwards, Thomas	Waterford		same	- same -	- same -
Elliott, Edward	same	same	20 June 1836	not registered	ditto in right of marriage.
Free, Richard	same	hotel-keeper	19 April 1831	10 Oct. 1832	ditto, apprenticeship.
Fleming, Robert	same	gentleman	27 Aug. 1832	- same -	ditto in right of birth.
Feyle, Samuel W.	Strang Mills	esquire	15 Sept. 1832	28 June 1835	ditto.
Farrell, Mathew	Waterford	same	2 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Fleming, Nicholas	same	cooper	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Fleming, Andrew	same	cork-cutter	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Foy, Edward	same	shoe-maker	- same -	- same -	ditto.
Foy Richard	same	brazier	6 Oct. 1832	- same -	ditto.

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Rights under which admitted.
Franklin, John	Waterford	gentleman	10 June 1833	June sess. 1833	admitted in right of marriage.
Freemant, Joseph	same	chair-maker	9 Oct. 1831	Oct. sess. 1831	ditto, apprenticeship.
Forsyth, Edmund	Rochestown	esquire	29 Dec. 1831	Jan. sess. 1832	ditto in right of birth.
Fogarty, David	Waterford	mercant	29 Mar. 1832	4 April 1832	ditto, apprenticeship.
Goale, Henry	same	painter	9 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto in right of birth.
Gibbons, George	same	cabinet-maker	6 Oct. 1832	same	ditto.
Gibbons, Henry		same			
Gibbons, Austin	same	cooper	same	same	ditto.
Gibbons, William		printer			
Gamble, John	same	iron-founder	same	same	ditto.
Goldrup, George A.	same	sq., 70th regiment	5 Jan. 1833	June sess. 1833	ditto in right of birth.
Goldrup, James	same	capt. 60th rifles	same		
Gooden, Samuel	same	cabinet-makers	27 Mar. 1833	Mar. sess. 1833	ditto.
Gooden, Thomas					
Graham, Benjamin, jun.	same	gentleman	same	June sess. 1833	ditto.
Gharrille, James G.	same	same	10 June 1833	same	ditto.
Greene, John	same	esquires	22 Mar. 1833	3 April 1833	ditto.
Greene, Hugh	same	same	22 June 1833	20 June 1833	ditto.
Galway, James					
Gatchell, George	same	merchant	same	same	ditto.
Hadras, Robert	same	gentleman	9 June 1831	not registered	ditto.
Harris, Thomas	same	esquire	20 June 1831	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Howard, Robert	same	market constable	15 Sept. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Hughan, Vincent	same	weaver	same	same	ditto.
Hugh, Hall Deney	same	cooper	same	same	ditto.
Hill, Benjamin	same	shoemaker	same	same	ditto.
Hughes, Mathew	same	esquires	same	same	ditto.
Hughes, John					
Hughes, Humphrey	same	clerk	same	same	ditto.
Hughes, Rev. William	same	printer	20 Sept. 1833	same	ditto.
Holmes, Richard	same	shoemaker	same	same	ditto.
Holmes, John	same	weaver	same	same	ditto.
Hughson, John					
Hughson, Samuel	same	painter	6 Oct. 1832	same	ditto.
Hughson, William	same	weaver	same	same	ditto.
Egley, Samuel	cooper				
Henderson, William	same	cabinet-maker	same	same	ditto.
Holmes, John	same	shoemaker	same	same	ditto.
Holmes, William	same	printer	same	same	ditto.
Hoody, Alexander	same	painter	same	same	ditto.
Hughson, Christopher	same	writing-clerk	same	same	ditto.
Robert, George	same	schoolmaster	same	same	ditto.
Hogan, Henry	same	shoemaker	same	same	ditto.
Hodges, Benjamin	same	chaise-driver	same	same	ditto.
Hughson, Tobias	same	lath-splitter	same	same	ditto in right of marriage.
Berket, James R. L.	same	esquire	27 Mar. 1833	March sess. 1833	ditto in right of birth.
Hobson, Rev. Henry T.	Road-stuff	clerk	same	Apr. - 1834	ditto in right of marriage.
Hill, William S.	Waterford	esquire	same	June - 1833	ditto in right of birth.
Holmes, Arthur	same	cabinet-maker	10 June 1833	same	ditto.
Hughson, Edward	same	lath splitter	same	same	ditto.
Hess, Arthur P.	Tramore	esquire	20 Dec. 1834	June - 1836	ditto in right of marriage.
Hobberlin, James	Waterford	cabinet-maker	20 June 1835	Oct. - 1836	ditto, apprenticeship.
Hazard, Richard H.	same	esquire	27 Dec. 1836	20 Dec. 1836	ditto in right of birth.
Johnson, William	same	same	15 Sept. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
John, John Hartrey	Mullinabro	same	same	same	ditto.
Iris, William W.	Waterford	gentleman	same	same	ditto.
John, Samuel H.	Mullinabro	esquire	25 Mar. 1835	3 April 1835	ditto.
Kear, Nicholas	Waterford	corn buyer	15 Sept. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Kelly, James	same	shoemaker	26 Sept. 1833	same	ditto, apprenticeship.
Keating, Thomas	same	same	8 Oct. 1832	same	ditto in right of marriage.
Kearny, Thomas	same	ropemaker	2 Oct. 1832	same	ditto, apprenticeship.
Kelly, James, jun.	same	shoemaker	6 Oct. 1832	same	ditto in right of birth.
Keating, Edward	same	same	10 June 1833	June sess. 1833	ditto.
Kear, Thomas	same	same	23 Mar. 1835	Apr. - 1835	ditto.
Kear, Thomas	same	gentleman	27 Dec. 1836	not registered	ditto.
Langley, Henry	same	esquire	15 Sept. 1835	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Langley, John William	same	same			
Lees, Westara W.	Greenville	same	26 Sept. 1832	same	ditto.
Lees, Henry Robert	Tramore	same	9 Oct. 1832	same	ditto.
Leake, Edward	Waterford	weaver	6 Oct. 1832	same	ditto.
Lyons, John	same	constable	same	same	ditto in right of marriage.
Loydd, William	same	esquire	same	same	ditto.
Lewson, Joseph A.	same	a. n.	25 Mar. 1835	3 April 1835	ditto in right of birth.
Lee, Unker T.	same	esquire	25 June 1834	26 June 1835	ditto.
Lee, Edward	same	same	14 Jan. 1834	Apr. sess. 1834	ditto.
Leake, George	same	painter	25 Mar. 1836	25 June 1836	ditto.
Leaigue, Thomas	Charlestown	gentleman	same	26 Dec. 1836	ditto.

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of right under which admitted.
Langley, William S.	Waterford	M. D.	20 June 1836	19 Oct. 1836	admitted in right of birth.
Merridy, David, jun.	same	gentleman	29 June 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Moore, William	same	esquire	same	26 June 1835	ditto in right of marriage.
Morris, Benjamin	same	captain 25th regt.	15 Sept. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto in right of birth.
Mackery, John	same	apothecary	26 Sept. 1832	same	ditto.
Mason, Joshua, jun.	same	esquire	same	same	ditto.
M'Grath, Thomas	same	gentleman	same	same	ditto.
Mahony, George	same	constable	same	same	ditto.
M'Donald, Stephen	same	shoemaker	same	same	ditto.
Maher, James	Tramore	gentleman	same	same	ditto.
Maher, John Walters	same	same	same	same	ditto.
M'Grath, John	Waterford	lawyer	9 Oct. 1832	same	ditto.
M'Daniel, Edmund	same	reparmaker	same	same	ditto, apprenticeship.
M'Daniel, Thomas	same	same	same	same	ditto.
M'Laughlin, Thomas	same	painter	6 Oct. 1832	same	ditto in right of birth.
M'Laughlin, James					
M'Laughlin, William					
Martin, George	same	musician	same	same	ditto.
Mills, Thomas	same	watchmaker	same	same	ditto.
Moan, John	same	shoemaker	same	same	ditto.
Murray, Denis	same	gentleman	same	same	ditto.
Meyers, John F.	same	same	same	same	ditto.
Moerison, David	same	wearer	same	same	ditto in right of marriage.
May, Thomas	same	smith	same	same	ditto.
Maloney, Michael	same	copper	same	same	ditto.
Miles, James	same	painter	18 Oct. 1832	Jan. sess. 1835	ditto in right of birth.
Murphy, John	same	schoolmaster	27 Mar. 1833	Mar. 1833	ditto.
Moan, William	same	shoemaker	9 Oct. 1834	Oct. sess. 1834	ditto.
Marrison, Samuel	same	bookbinder	same	3 April 1835	ditto, apprenticeship.
Marcell, William A. R.	same	esquire	22 Mar. 1836	9 Oct. 1835	ditto in right of birth.
Mackery, William	same	same	22 June 1835	26 June 1835	ditto.
Meyers, Humphrey	same	gentleman	same	same	ditto.
Moritt, James A.	same	same	same	same	ditto.
Mason, James	same	barber	same	not registered	ditto.
Moore, Benjamin	same	gentleman	6 Oct. 1835	9 Oct. 1835	ditto.
Meeris, Thomas	same	shoemaker	29 Mar. 1836	19 Oct. 1836	ditto.
Morris, William, jun.	Bello Lake	gentleman	17 Oct. 1836	same	ditto.
Mackley, Joseph P.	Waterford	esquire	same	same	ditto.
Moore, George	May Park	same	same	same	ditto in right of marriage.
Noble, John	Waterford	probationer	20 June 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto in right of birth.
Newport, Charles	same	esquire	16 Sept. 1832	same	ditto.
Newport, Simon	same	same	same	same	ditto.
Norington, Samuel	same	shoemaker	6 Oct. 1832	same	ditto.
Neill, George	same	cutler	same	same	ditto.
Newport, John	same	esquire	22 June 1835	9 Oct. 1835	ditto.
Newport, Robert	same	same	17 Oct. 1836	19 Oct. 1836	ditto.
O'Hara, Joseph	same	constable	15 Sept. 1832	16 Oct. 1832	ditto in right of marriage.
O'Keefe, Patrick	same	esquire	same	same	ditto.
Phelan, Walter	same	attorney-at-law	9 June 1831	same	ditto in right of birth.
Pope, Richard A.	same	attorney	29 June 1832	same	ditto.
Priest, William J.	same	esquire	15 Sept. 1832	same	ditto.
Phelan, John	Ballygranger	same	same	same	ditto.
Phelan, Robert	Waterford	carpenter	same	same	ditto in right of marriage.
Palmer, James	same	tailor	20 Sept. 1832	same	ditto in right of birth.
Popham, Edward	Tramore	esquire	same	not registered	ditto in right of marriage.
Power, Patrick	Bellevue	same	same	Jan. sess. 1835	ditto in right of birth.
Power, Robert	Waterford	dyeer	2 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Phelan, Lawrence	same	brass-founder	same	same	ditto, apprenticeship.
Phelan, Edmund	same	printer	same	same	ditto.
Pyse, George H.	same	gentleman	6 Oct. 1832	same	ditto in right of birth.
Pyse, Thomas	same	same	same	same	ditto.
Pepper, John	same	constable	same	same	ditto.
Power, James	East Passage	mariner	same	same	ditto in right of marriage.
Power, Francis	Waterford	cabinet-maker	same	same	ditto, apprenticeship.
Power, Andrew	same	shoemaker	same	same	ditto in right of marriage.
Parker, James	same	tailor	27 Mar. 1835	20 Mar. 1835	ditto in right of birth.
Priest, James	same	condwainer	same	same	ditto.
Prosser, Simon	same	gentleman	9 Oct. 1834	Oct. sess. 1834	ditto.
Prosser, William	same	wheel-winger	26 Dec. 1834	Jan. sess. 1835	ditto in right of marriage.
Pope, Thomas	same	gentleman	23 Mar. 1836	3 April 1836	ditto in right of birth.
Power, Patrick Wm.	Bellevue	esquire	29 Mar. 1836	4 April 1836	ditto.
Power, Nicholas A.	same	same	same	same	ditto.
Priest, James, jun.	Waterford	cabinet-maker	same	same	ditto.
Ryland, Burton	same	esquire	18 Jan. 1831	not registered	ditto.
Ryquett, Richard	Grantstown	same	15 Sept. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Ryland, Marley	Waterford	same	same	same	ditto.
Roche, Maurice	Belmont	labourer	same	same	ditto in right of marriage.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[53]

NAME.	RESIDENCE.	DESCRIPTION.	DATE of Admission.	DATE of Registration.	STATEMENT of Right under which admitted.
Reardon, Jeremiah	Waterford	rope-maker	3 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	admitted in right of birth.
Reynolds, John	same	gentleman	same	same	ditto.
Roberts, Michael	same	esquire	9 Oct. 1832	same	ditto.
Rogers, Thomas	same	mariner	same	same	ditto.
Rogers, John	Passage	same	same	same	ditto.
Ryan, Patrick	Waterford	stone-cutter	same	same	ditto in right of marriage.
Rath, Alexander	same	shoemaker	same	same	ditto, apprenticeship.
Renay, Rev. Patrick	Dunkelt	clerk	25 Feb. 1833	March sess. 1833	ditto in right of marriage.
Ridgway, Geo. N.	Waterford	esquire	10 June 1833	June sess. 1833	ditto in right of birth.
Roberts, Thomas S.	same	same	9 Oct. 1834	Jan. 1835	ditto.
Stephens, John	Dromina	same	19 April 1831	16 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Shannon, William	Waterford	same	9 June 1831	not registered	ditto.
Scott, Jas. J. M. M.	same	merchant	29 June 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto in right of marriage.
Sarroy, George J.	same	gentleman	15 Sept. 1832	same	ditto in right of birth.
Stacey, William	same	chandler	same	same	ditto.
Shannon, Alex. H.	same	solicitor	same	same	ditto.
Shaw, John	same	major 67th regt.	same	same	ditto.
Smith, Samuel	same	corn-dealer	same	same	ditto, apprenticeship.
Sleator, George	Kilnascow	servant	25 Sept. 1832	same	ditto in right of birth.
Stagman, Thomas H.	Waterford	esquire	same	same	ditto.
Sprigg, George	Croahilly	same	same	not registered	ditto.
Shannon, Josiah	Waterford	gentleman	same	18 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Shannon, Thomas	same	same	same	same	ditto.
Sweeny, James B.	same	apothecary	same	same	ditto.
Shelton, John	same	rope-maker	2 Oct. 1832	same	ditto in right of marriage.
Sullivan, Matthew	same	printer	same	same	ditto, apprenticeship.
Sullivan, Patrick	same	fronthead	same	same	ditto.
Strong, Michael	same	rope-maker	same	same	ditto.
Stuart, Anna	same	poetess	same	same	ditto.
Suith, John	same	shoemaker	9 Oct. 1832	same	ditto in right of birth.
Suith, Alexander	same	stone-cutter	same	same	ditto.
Suith, Richard	same	painter	same	same	ditto.
Suith, Thomas	same	same	same	same	ditto.
Stewart, James	same	shoemaker	same	same	ditto in right of marriage.
Suith, William	same	painter	10 June 1833	June sess. 1833	ditto in right of birth.
Sullivan, William	same	pump-maker	9 Oct. 1834	Oct. sess. 1834	ditto.
Shannon, Thomas	same	gentleman	same	same	ditto.
Stephens, John	Ballyhack	shoemaker	20 Dec. 1834	not registered	ditto in right of marriage.
Sunder, Christopher	Waterford	merchant	22 June 1835	22 June 1835	ditto in right of birth.
Scott, John	same	same	26 Mar. 1835	4 April 1835	ditto in right of marriage.
Sullivan, James	same	clerk	same	same	ditto in right of birth.
Sarroy, John	same	gentleman	same	same	ditto.
Suith, Robert Holmes	same	same	17 Oct. 1832	19 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Sleator, Thomas	Kilnascow	parish clerk	same	same	ditto.
Suith, Arthur	Waterford	attorney	27 Dec. 1834	not registered	ditto.
Suith, Thomas D.	same	printer	same	same	ditto.
Taylor, Charles	same	gentleman	6 June 1831	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Taney, Evan	same	same	20 June 1833	same	ditto in right of marriage.
Talbot, William Inodd	Belle Lake	esquire	18 Sept. 1832	same	ditto.
Turnan, Henry	Waterford	gentleman	9 Oct. 1832	same	ditto in right of birth.
Todd, William	same	wearer	same	same	ditto.
Turfill, George	same	printer	same	same	ditto, apprenticeship.
Tisdale, David	same	gardener	26 Dec. 1834	Jan. sess. 1835	ditto.
Trin, Charles	same	mariner	9 Oct. 1833	9 Oct. 1833	ditto in right of marriage.
Unsworth, Isaac	Passage	gentleman	9 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto in right of birth.
Wright, James L.	Waterford	same	16 Sept. 1832	same	ditto.
Wye, George	same	esquire	same	same	ditto.
Walsh, Martin	same	farmer	same	same	ditto.
Walsh, William	same	same	same	same	ditto.
Wallace, Thomas	same	mariner	same	same	ditto.
Warren, Richard	same	shoemaker	26 Sept. 1832	same	ditto.
Warren, John	same	same	same	same	ditto in right of marriage.
White, George	same	esquire	same	same	ditto in right of birth.
Wallace, Robert	same	shoemaker	2 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1832	ditto.
Wallace, James	same	carpenter	same	same	ditto.
White, Nicholas	same	cock-cutter	same	same	ditto, apprenticeship.
Walsh, Michael	same	rope-maker	same	same	ditto in right of birth.
West, James	same	shoemaker	9 Oct. 1832	same	ditto in right of marriage.
Walton, Joseph	same	constable	same	same	ditto in right of birth.
Watson, George A.	Treasore	gentleman	10 June 1833	June sess. 1833	ditto in right of marriage.
Wilson, John	Waterford	pump-beer	same	same	ditto in right of marriage.
Waring, Samuel	Springfield	esquire	23 Mar. 1833	3 April 1833	ditto in right of birth.
Waring, John	same	same	same	same	ditto.
White, Albert	Waterford	merchant	3 Mar. 1833	same	ditto.
Wade, William	same	gentleman	17 Oct. 1832	not registered	ditto.

(Examined)

R. Cooper, Town-Clerk.

Appendix (C.)

Appendix (C.)
Rentcharges
Registered since
1830.

A RETURN of the Number of RENTCHARGES Registered at each Session, since the 1st October 1830, stating the Name and Residence of each Person so Registered, the Barony and Denomination of Land on which the Charge was granted, and the Name of the Person granting the same; distinguishing the 50 l. from the 20 l. Rentcharges.

SCHEDULE.

Antrim - - County.	Galway County.	Mayo - - County.
Armagh - - -	Galway County Town.	Meath - - -
Carlow - - -	Kerry County.	Monaghan - -
Carrickfergus Town.	Kildare - - -	Queens - - -
Cavan County.	Kilkenny - -	Roscommon - -
Clare - - -	Kilkenny City.	Sligo - - -
Cork - - -	King's County.	Tipperary - -
Cork City.	Leitrim - - -	Tyrone - - -
Donegal County.	Limerick - -	Waterford - -
Down - - -	Limerick City.	Waterford City.
Drogheda Town.	Londonderry County.	Westmeath County.
Dublin County.	Longford - -	Wexford - - -
Fermanagh - -	Louth - - -	Wicklow - - -

A Return to this Order is still outstanding from Dublin City.

7 April 1837.

COUNTY OF ANTRIM.

Number Registered.	Name and Residence.	Barony and Denomination of Land.	Name of Person granting.	Amount.	Date of Registry.
1	William Hunter, Dunmurry.	- Divis and Black Mountain, and Alogarron, barony of Belfast.	not recorded	£ 50	Oct. 1832.
2	James Hunter, ditto	- Same lands - - -	- ditto - - -	50	ditto.
3	Henry Leslie, Leslie Hill	- - Kilmyle, barony of Carey.	Jas. Leslie, esq.	20	ditto.
4	James Edmond Leslie, Leslie Hill.	- - Moyeraig, barony of Carey.	- same - - -	20	ditto.
5	John Chas. Wm. Leslie	- - Drumreagh, barony of Carey.	- same - - -	20	ditto.
6	Alexander Markham, Newtownglens.	- Frumore, Ballywoolly, barony of Lower Glensarrin.	not recorded	50	ditto.
7	Francis K. Bowserie, Grange.	- Grange, barony of Upper Toome.	- ditto - - -	20	ditto.
8	F. S. Leslie, Leslie Hill -	- Carroneagh, barony of Carey.	Jas. Leslie, esq.	20	Oct. 1834.
9	John Boyce, Tallaghan	- Tallaghan, barony of Kileconway.	not recorded	20	Oct. 1835.

16 March 1837.

S. Stevens, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF ARNAGE.

Name and Residence of Person Registering from Recharge place on 1st October 1832.	Barony and Description of Land on which the Recharge was granted.	Name of Person granting the vote.	£. 50 or £. 20 Recharge.
John White Greer, of Woodville	lands of Woodville, barony of O'Neil and East.	George Greer	20
Wm. John Hancock, of Lurgan	lands of Brownlow's Derry, same barony	Charles Brownlow	20
Joseph M'Kee, of Markethill	lands of Clare, barony of Lower Orier	Barnet M'Kee	20
John Porter Harris, of Ashfort	lands of Ashfort, barony of Turvey	Hugh Harris	20
Robt. M'Neal, of Corlingford county Leath.	lands of Killeen and Clanzigera, barony of Upper Orier.	James Woolfe M'Neal	20
Jas. M. Stronge, jun., Tynan Abbey	lands of Corfeighan, barony of Turvey	Sir Jas. M. Stronge	20
Henry Harris, of Ashfort.	lands of Unshag, barony of Turvey.	Hugh Harris	20

24 February 1837.

Leonard Dobbin, jun., Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF CARLOW.

No.	Name and Residence.	Description.	Barony.	Name of Person granting.	Amount.	Section when Registered.
1	Bunbury, Benjamin, Russelstown	Russelstown	Carlow	Henry Bunbury	20	Oct. 1831.
2	Bunbury, Henry, ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20	—
3	Burton, Benjamin, Burton-hall	Hugh	Idroon, East	Wm. F. Burton	20	—
4	Coffey, Maria, Carlow	Carlow	Carlow	John Coffey	20	—
5	Carey, Henry, ditto	Kilmanny	ditto	Colonel Bruen	20	—
6	Carey, William, Ballinacarrig	Ballinacarrig	ditto	ditto	20	—
7	Ducket, Thomas, Belview	Friarstown	ditto	James Ducket	20	—
8	Ducket, Jonas, jun., ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20	—
9	Clear, John, Rosdillig	Seskinmadha	Idroon, East	John Clear, jun.	20	—
10	Dayne, Robert, Beris	Ballycarney	Carlow	Hensletta Dayne	20	—
11	Elliott, William, Ratheroe	Ratheroe	ditto	Thomas Elliott	20	—
12	Faulkner, Hugh, Castletown	Gregginsbeg	Forth	Henry Faulkner	20	—
13	Graves, Hugh Ryves, Dublin	Raboe	ditto	not mentioned in a Book	20	—
14	Garret, James P., Janeville	Grigginsbeg	ditto	William Garret	20	—
15	Gray, John, Upton	Ballyhubbee	Idroon, East	Robert Gray	20	—
16	Hadcock, Isaac, Dublin	Carlow	Carlow	Francis Deilan	20	—
17	Hutchinson, James, ditto	Ballykealy	Forth	not mentioned	20	—
18	Hutchinson, John Dawson, ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20	—
19	Hutchinson, Dawson, ditto	Coppineagh	Rathvilly	ditto	20	—
20	Hutchinson, Samuel, ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20	—
21	Hutchinson, Summers, ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20	—
22	Hutchinson, Frederick, ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20	—
23	Hutchinson, Joseph Fide, ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20	—
24	Hatchell, John, ditto	Ballynochan	St. Mullins	ditto	20	—
25	Jones, Francis, Hacketstown	Ballyilduff	Rathvilly	ditto	20	—
26	Lecky, John James, Kilslogue	Newgardens	Carlow	John Lecky	20	—
27	Murphy, Rev. John Balinakil	Knockmore	St. Mullins	not mentioned	20	—
28	Mathers, John, Cronseck	Cronseck	Rathvilly	James Mathers	20	—
29	Stackpole, Rev. W. H., Dean of Kilsnoe.	Ballon	Forth	not mentioned	20	—
30	Thornton, Samuel, Palatine Town	Knockard	Carlow	Wm. H. Thornton	20	Oct. 1832.
31	Watson, John Lecky, Kilsnoe	Kilsnoe	Idroon, East	John Watson	20	—
32	Barker, Simon, Eaglehill	Eaglehill	Rathvilly	not mentioned	20	Oct. 1833.
33	Dawning, Arthur Mann, Sherwood	Sherwood	Forth	Rev. S. Dawning	20	—
34	Herring, Darby Wm. Cooper, Shrule	Rathoran	Idroon, West	H. H. Cooper	20	—
35	Butler, Richard P. Ballintemple	Garryhadden	ditto	Sir Thos. Butler	20	—
36	Herring, Charles, Shrule	Rathoran	ditto	H. H. Cooper	20	June 1834.
37	Edge, John D., Clonbrock	Rathcrooneen	ditto	John Edge	20	20 June —
38	Alexander, Lorenzo, Milford	Cloacree	Carlow	John Alexander	20	April 1835.
39	Alexander, George, ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20	—
40	Bunbury, Thomas C., Russelstown	Russelstown	ditto	Henry Bunbury	20	—
41	Estace, Hardy, Ardreen	Rathra	Forth	Robert Estace	20	Jan. 1835.
42	Humbey, Benjamin, Dublin	Greenlaze	Carlow	Alex. Humbey	20	June —
43	Langford, Richard, Knockinstoneagh	Knockinstoneagh	Forth	Michael Kelly	20	April —
44	Smith, Alfred, London, Ballydartin	Ballykealy	ditto	John J. Lecky	20	—
45	Watson, W., Liverpool, Ballydartin	Ballydartin	Idroon, East	John Watson	20	—
46	Watson, John, jun., Ballydartin	Ballydartin	ditto	ditto	20	—
47	Cranston, John, county Tyrone	Balinabreua	Idroon, West	John Alexander	20	20 Jan. 1836.

(continued)

No.	Name and Residence.	Demonstration.	Barony.	Name of Person granting.	Amount.	Grants when registered.
48	Durkin, Michael, Crummore -	Crummore -	Forth -	grantor not ment ^d	£.	20 Jan. 1831.
49	Fishbourne, Joseph, Queen's county	Carlow -	Carlow -	Thos. Fishbourne -	50	20 June -
50	Fishbourne, Robert, Leary -	8 acres, Carlow	Carlow -	Wm. Fishbourne -	50	Jan. -
51	Garret, Samuel, Janeville -	Kilmoeklin -	Forth -	Wm. Garret -	50	April -
52	Irvine, Henry, Dublin -	Meonacarra -	Carlow -	Rev. Thos. James	50	Oct. -
53	Jackson, Adina, Grinigue -	Quinamore -	ditto -	Wm. Jackson -	50	April -
54	Vigors, John Cliff, Bartego -	Ballynacchan -	Idroon, West	Rev. J. Vigors -	50	Jan. -
55	Handy, John, Barraghmore -	Belinabran -	ditto -	John Alexander -	50	ditto.
56	Handy, Heming, ditto -	ditto -	ditto -	ditto -	50	ditto.
57	Handy, Samuel, ditto -	ditto -	ditto -	ditto -	50	ditto.
58	Hatchell, Geo., Ludford, Co. Dublin	Kildivin -	St. Mullins	John Hatchell -	50	Oct. -

A. J. Haughey, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF CARRICKFERGUS.

Date of Registry.	Name and Residence of Person registered.	Name of Grant.	Description on which charged.	Amount of Benchrgy.
Special sessions in October 1832.	- - the Hon. and Rev. Edward Chichester, commonly called Lord Edward Chichester, of Ruyhoo, in the county of Donegal, clerk, Dean of Raphoe.	- - the most Hon. Geo. Augustus, Marquis of Donegal, and the Right Hon. George Hamilton Chichester, Earl of Belfast.	- - the lands of the castles of Jaymeant, Burtet and Dobbins, and the sites of the late dissolved priory of St. Francis, and monastery of Woodburn, in the parish of St. Nicholas, in the borough of Carrickfergus.	£. 20.

1 March 1837.

Adina Cunningham, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF CAVAN.

Name of Person registered.	Residence.	Demonstration of Land.	Barony.	Name of Person granting Benchrgy.	£. 20.	£. 50.	Years when registered.
1. Samuel Wincer, esq.	Tullyard, co. Meath	- - townland of Killester.	Castleraghan -	- - J. Pratt Winter, esq.	-	50	1831
2. Benj. Pratt Winter, esq.	Agher, co. Meath	Killester -	ditto -	same -	-	50	
3. Hen. Maxwell, esq.	Farnham -	Crover -	Clonsabon -	Lord Farnham	50	50	
4. Somerset R. Maxwell, esq.	same -	Crover -	ditto -	same -	-	50	
5. Oliver Nugent, esq.	Bobsgrove -	Bobsgrove -	ditto -	- - Clein. E. T. Nugent, esq.	-	50	
6. John Donnelly, esq.	- Blackwater Town, co. Armagh.	Galboly -	Clonkee -	Sir Wm. Young -	-	50	
7. John Donnelly, jun.	Armagh -	Rakeevan -	ditto -	same -	-	50	
8. Wm. Donnelly, esq.	Balle Bow Castle	Rakeevan -	ditto -	same -	-	50	
9. John Young, esq.	Balle Bow Castle	Rakeevan -	ditto -	same -	-	50	
10. Asketoll Young, esq.	- Blackwater Town, co. Armagh.	Rakeevan -	ditto -	same -	-	50	
11. Rev. John Young	-- Killeshee Glebe, co. Tyrone.	Rakeevan -	ditto -	same -	-	50	
12. John Gunley, esq.	-- Lower Gardiner-street, Dublin.	Kilduff -	Lower Loughtee	(not set forth)	-	50	
13. Rev. Edw. Nixon	- - - -	Knoghans -	ditto -	(not set forth)	50	50	1832
14. John Wilson -	Balleboro -	Curlish -	Clonkee -	John Wilson, sen.	-	50	
15. Hugh Swansey, gent., Alley.	- - Rockfield, co. Monaghan.	Drumcree -	Clonsabon -	H. Swansey, esq.	-	50	1835
16. R. Burrows, esq.	Sradear House -	Knocknock -	Upper Loughtee	Thos. Burrows, esq.	-	50	
17. Gerard Moore, esq.	Cullies -	- - Cullies and Drumbow.	same -	Sam. Moore, esq.	-	50	1835
18. R. Blackwood, esq.	5th Dragoon Guards	Cletery -	Upper Loughtee	- - R. B. Blackwood, esq.	50	-	

* Voter since dead.

15 March 1837.

Edward E. Mayor, Dep. Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF CLARE.

No.	Name and Residence of Rentcharge.	Barony.	Description of Land on which Charge is granted.	Name of Person granting Rentcharge.	Amount of Rentcharge.
1	William Arthur, Ennis - -	Islands - -	Cloncolman - - -	Thomas Arthur, esq.	£ 20
2	Walter Arthur, ditto - -	Inchiquin - -	Dromecavan - - -	Thomas Arthur - -	20
3	Charles Brew, ditto - - -	ditto - - -	Tourcon - - -	Thomas Brew - -	50
4	Patrick Haire, ditto - - -	Islands - - -	Clehanagour - - -	James Haire - - -	20
5	Samuel Bindon, jun., Waterpark.	Tulla - - -	Cleatrasheen - - -	Samuel Bindon - -	20
6	George Marshall Staeepole, Kiltenera.	Islands - - -	Craghrien - - -	- - Very Rev. Wm. H. Staeepole.	50
7	Hon. Seymour Moore Vandeleur, Dublin.	Moyarta - - -	Leadmore - - -	Crofton M. Vandeleur	50
8	James Creagh, jun., Cahirsane.	Burrenally - -	Cahirsane - - -	James Creagh - - -	20
9	Mortough O'Brien, Colmahill Cottage.	ditto - - -	- - Locknessmore and Poulisickane.	Terence O'Brien - -	20
10	Richard Macnamara, Loughscarr.	Islands - - -	Bushy Park - - -	Wm. N. Macnamara - -	20
11	Casock Rooney, Templehill, co. Dublin.	Herickane - -	- - Troncross of the Castle and Bihoreo.	- - Jas. P. O'Gorman Mahon.	50
12	John Collins, Ennis - - -	Islands - - -	Ennis - - -	James Hebbé - - -	20
13	Francis Fitzgerald, Ballyshanny.	Corcomroe - -	- - Craggslet and Lysaghtplot.	John Fitzgerald - -	20

Wm. Keen,
Clerk of the Peace.

6 March 1837.

COUNTY OF COEK.

No.	Name.	Residence.	Barony.	Description.	Name of Person granting.	Value.	Section in which Registered.
1	Thos. Beemish	Kilmoodea -	E. D. E. Carbery -	Sheaf - -	Sampson Beemish -	50	Bandon, Oct. 1832.
2	John Beemish	Kaucknamilla	E. D. W. Carbery -	Kaucknamilla	Samuel Beemish -	20	Macroom, Oct. -
3	Nich. Danovan	Cock - - -	W. D. E. Carbery -	Arckit - -	not stated - - -	20	Bandon, Oct. -
4	Alex. Stewart	Cove - - -	same - - -	Kinnibeg - -	Bice - - -	50	Macroom, Oct. -
5	Franklin Baldwin.	Bandon - -	W. D. W. Carbery	Rushpanisky -	Ike - - -	20	Bantry, Oct. -
6	Edw. Hunt -	Kinsale - -	same - - -	Ballybrack -	Wm. R. Hill - -	50	Bandon, Nov. -
7	Regina O'Sullivan.	Bandon - -	Kinahenny - -	Premises, Bandon.	Wm. G. Allan - -	20	same.
8	Tm. Horgan -	Lehina - -	West Muskerry -	Carriggulla -	John Horgan - -	20	Macroom, Oct. -
9	John Bourke -	City Cork -	Barretts - - -	Coolee - - -	- - Joseph L. Wetherall.	50	Cork, Nov. -
10	Rob. Warren -	same - - -	same - - -	Kilmentane -	John Warren - -	50	Middleton, Nov. -
11	Thos. Campion, jun.	Park - - -	Condoon - - -	Leitrim - - -	Thos. Campion, sen.	50	Fermoy, Oct. -
12	Emm. Hannon	Michellstown	same - - -	Kilomey - - -	Margaret Hannon -	20	same.
13	John Heare -	Fermoy - -	same - - -	Castlehyde -	John Hyde - - -	20	same.
14	John Aldworth	Newmarstret	Dunallow - - -	Ballybrack -	Rob. R. Aldworth -	50	Cork, Sept. 1815.
15	Wm. Wilson -	Cecilstown -	Dunallow - - -	Ballygiblin -	- - Sir Wm. W. Becher.	50	Kanturk, Nov. 1832.
16	Geo. Berkeley	Cock - - -	Fermoy - - -	- - East Drangariffe.	Sarah Berkeley - -	20	Cork, Oct. -
17	Robert J. Berkeley.	same - - -	same - - -	same lands -	same - - -	20	same.

(continued)

No.	Name.	Residence.	County.	Designation.	Name of Person granting.	Value.	Season at which Righted.
18	Robert Cole Bowen.	Bowen's Court	Ferney	Ballyfought	St. John Galloway	£. 20	Malloy, Oct. 1872.
19	Eugene Byrne	Mount Gifford	same	Loughnagane	Eugene Byrne, sen.	20	Ferney, Oct.
20	Ralph Evans	Castlelna	same	Carber	Nich. Green Evans	50	Malloy, Oct.
21	Wm. Galloway	Mallow	same	Ballyfought	St. John Galloway	50	same.
22	James Langley Hewson.	Mitchelstown	same	Coburnee	James Hewson, sen.	20	same.
23	Jas. Mc'Mullen	City Cork	same	Nagles Mountain	Lord Gort	50	Cork, Oct.
24	Math. Seward	Beaufort	same	Drumaligo	Nolle Seward	20	Malloy, Nov.
25	Thos. Achilles Deant.	Coalingog	Kericrothy	Fahala	Thos. Deant	50	Cork, Oct.
26	Thos. Burke	Prospect Villa	East Muskerry	Courthrock	Daniel Conner	same.	same.
27	N. Dunscombe	Mount Desert	same	Cloughphilip	Justin McCarthy	50	same.
28	Mussy H. Warren.	Shandangan	same	Shandangan	Samuel Penrose	50	same.
29	P. Dunwoth	Gortree	Overy and Kiltore	Charleville	James Dunwoth	20	Malloy, Oct.
30	W. Dence Freeman.	Casheen	same	Ballmalta	not stated	50	Malloy, April 1872.
31	Patrick Hogan	Charleville	same	Fordlands	Andrew Butwell	50	Malloy, Oct. 1872.
32	Edw. Newman	City of Cork	same	- Mill-land, Charlevilla.	Richard Rowland	20	Cork, Oct.
33	Geo. C. Becher	Hollybrook	E. D. E. Carbery	Cahergal	Rich. H. H. Becher	20	Bandon, Oct. 1872.
34	R. O'Donovan Becher.	same	same	same	same	20	same.
35	Rev. F. Beamish	Shandrum	E. D. W. Carbery	Lokemount	George Beamish	20	same.
36	M. W. O'Donovan.	Dunderrow	same	Carraigfadda	Norgan O'Donovan	20	same.
37	Geo. Robinson	Cork City	W. D. W. Carbery	Coween	Jane Robinson	20	same.
38	Chas. Evanson	Four-mile Water	same	Droasca	Nathaniel Evanson	20	Crosskilly, July
39	A. M. Evanson	Bardou	same	same lands	same person	20	same.
40	Hungerford B. Evanson.	Four-mile Water	same	same	same	20	Bandon, Oct.
41	H. B. Evanson	City of Cork	same	Brashick	Rev. A. Evanson	20	same.
42	J. McCarthy	Crosskilly	same	Ballyniskey	not stated	20	Crosskilly, July
43	Pierce Cotter	Cork City	West Muskerry	Inchigane	P. B. Browne	20	Skibbereen, May
44	Rev. N. C. Dunscombe.	same	same	Bawnore	Philip Harding	20	Bandon, Oct.
45	John Walsby	Maaseytown	same	Kiltagortney	Mussy H. Mussy	20	Macroom, Dec.
46	Thos. Cuthbert	Garretstown	Barretts	Corballymore	- Thos. Cuthbert Kenny.	50	Cork, Sept.
47	John Aldworth	Newmarket	Duhallow	Newmarket	R. B. Aldworth	50	same.
48	James Reid	Millbank	Condons	Rothaly	David Reid	20	Kantuck, April
49	Rev. J. Allen	Lisacogill	Duhallow	Dromadoc	William Allen	20	Malloy, April
50	John Newman	Dromore	same	Scanna & Gortree	Adam Newman	20	same.
51	J. M. Wrixon	Ballygiblin	same	Glangol	Sir W. W. Becher	20	Kantuck, June
52	Nich. Evans	Oldison	Ferney	Carberbeg	Henry Evans	20	same.
53	Mount Longfield.	Castlemory	Imokilly	Ballymallo	Rev. R. Longfield	50	Cork, Sept.
54	Jas. Stannard	co. Wexford	Barretts	Mishels, &c.	Thomas Butler	50	Malloy, April
55	W. Shane Fisher	Charleville	Barrymore	Bollinroagle	R. Clarke Fisher	50	Cork, Sept. 1872.
56	Ed. B. Roche	Kilshanick	same	Kilshanick	Edmond Roche	50	Millleton, Nov.
57	Rev. M. Collins	Castlecooke	Condons	Bellinamona	W. Cooke Collins	50	Ferney, Jan.
58	W. Cooke Collins, jun.	same	same	same	same	20	same.
59	Martin Lewis	Cork city	same	- - -	same in Ferney.	20	Millleton, Nov.
60	Beins Barry	Ballycleugh	Ferney	Ballycleugh	Henry Green Barry	20	Ferney, Jan.
61	James Lennox	Midwest	same	Castletownroche	T. H. Copinger	50	Malloy, April
62	John Reed	Millbank	same	Ferney	David Reid	50	Ferney, Jan. 1877.
63	Hon. Robert White.	Bentley House	Beer	Derrycaheen	R. Hedges Eyre	20	Macroom, Dec.
64	Hon. Simon White.	same	same	same	same	20	same.
65	Hon. W. White	same	Bantry	Trenamodern	Earl of Bentry	50	Bantry, Feb. 1876.
66	Hon. Henry B. Beresard.	Castlebrassard	E. D. E. Carbery	Ballymountain	Earl of Bandon	20	Bandon, Oct.
67	Thos. Evans	Bawnaskube	E. D. W. Carbery	Munmaskey	Thomas Evans	20	Skibbereen, May
68	T. H. Becher	Hollybrook	W. D. W. Carbery	Cahergal	R. Hedges Becher	20	same.
69	John Leader	Glanvieg	West Muskerry	Loekbane	John Wallis	20	Macroom, Dec.
70	Wm. Croske Ransyre.	City of Cork	same	Inchigane	Margaret Browne	50	Bandon, Nov. 1872.

CITY OF CORK.

Session.	Number registered.	Name of Person Registered.	Residence.	Description of Land on which Rentsharge granted.	Name of Person granting Rentsharge.	Whether col. or not.
Special Sessions, October 1837.	1	Daniel Cushman	- Cross's Green, city of Cork.	- - Cross's Green, in the south liberties of the city of Cork.	- - The affidavit of registry does not state the name of person granting rentscharge.	£ 20
	2	Deasil Casey	- Dominick-street, city of Cork.	- - Dominick street, otherwise called Standon Castle-lane, in the north suburbs of the city of Cork.	ditto - - -	20
	3	Richard Deneen	Lisheen, co. Cork	- - Bellinora, in the south liberties of the city of Cork.	ditto - - -	20
	4	Jas. Richard Day	- - Youghal, co. Cork.	- - Grange, in the parish of St. Finn Barr, in the south liberties, city of Cork.	ditto - - -	50
	5	Denis Lyons	- St. John-street, city of Cork.	- - St. John-street, in the north suburbs of the city of Cork.	ditto - - -	50
	6	Jas. Murphy, jun.	- Middleton, co. Cork.	- - Farnoverdowney, otherwise Yendoland, in the north liberties, city of Cork.	James Murphy, sen.	50
	7	Anthony Stanton	- Clarence-street, city of Cork.	- - Bailey's-lane, in the city of Cork.	- - The affidavit of registry does not state the name of person granting rentscharge.	20
Mallow Sessions, April 1835.	1	Tho. Newnham Blair.	- Ringskiddy, co. Cork.	- - Gustagullanc, Ballycraig and Lehanamora, in the county of the city of Cork.	Thomas Newnham	50
Mallow Sessions, April 1836.	1	John Newman	- Dromset House, co. Cork.	- - Christchurch lane, in the parish of the Holy Trinity, in the city of Cork.	Adam Newman	20
Cork Sessions, Sept. 1836.	1	Edmund Burke Roche.	- Trimbolgan, co. Cork.	- - The affidavit of registry does not state the description of land on which the rentscharge was granted.	Edward Roche	50
	2	Thomas Warren	- Barsallilly Cottage, co. Cork.	- - Bowrack-street, in the city of Cork.	Robert Warren	50

John Colburn, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF DONEGAL.

Number.	Name of Voter.	Residence.	Description of Land.	Barony.	Name of Grantor.	Amount of Charge.	Date of Registry.
1	John Spear	Knockygarra	Knockygarra	Raphoe	C. Colburn, esq.	£ 50	10th Oct. 1837.
2	John Robt. Boyd	Ballymacool	Lettuckerry	Kilmacrenan	John Boyd, esq.	50	15th Oct. 1837.
3	William Boyd	ditto	Killymaney	Raphoe	ditto	50	15th Oct. 1837.
4	John Stevenson	Lettuckerry	Ballymacadden	Kilmacrenan	C. Crawford, esq.	50	15th Oct. 1837.
5	Young Ralph	Thorn	Claro	Enishowen	G. Young, esq.	50	15th Oct. 1837.
6	Michael Jones	Lisgoola Abbey	Liscully	Tyrhugh	- Jones, esq.	20	26th Oct. 1837.
7	Francis Foster	Lackbeg	Mellaghduff	Boylagh	N. Foster, esq.	20	1st Nov. 1837.
8	Wybrants O'phert	Ballyconnell	Dromastiney	Kilmacrenan	Rev. J. O'phert	20	21st Oct. 1837.
9	H. St. Geo. Leyard	Malin	Carthage	Enishowen	O. Young, esq.	20	1st Jan. 1837.
10	Arthur Darley	Buncrana	Tollysville	ditto	W. Todd, esq.	20	23d June 1834.
11	Tho. D. Bateson	Londonderry	Castruse	Raphoe	Sir R. Bateson	20	31st Dec. 1837.
12	Faussett Hugh	Lisboda	- Lettickerry, Ballybeet, Glencar, Aughabilly, Lerycraugh, Ardara, Dosey and Crochmanna.	Kilmacrenan	R. Faussett, esq.	20	2d Jan. 1837.
13	Faussett, John	St. Catherine's	ditto	ditto	ditto	50	ditto.

8 March 1837.

James Colburn, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF DOWN.

Number of Fees-charged.	Sessions.	Name and Residence of Person Registered.	Barony and Description of Land on which Resurvey granted.	Name of Person who granted same.	Amount.
1	Downpatrick, 10 October 1830.	-- Robert Batt, of Purdyburn.	-- barony of Castlerough, lands of Ballyodis.	-- not stated in affidavit of registry.	£ 20
2	Same - - - -	-- Thomas Cregg Batt, of Purdyburn.	same - - - -	same - - - -	20
3	Same - - - -	-- Joseph Christy, of Kircassock.	- barony of Lower Iveagh, lands of Kircassock.	same - - - -	20
4	Same - - - -	-- Robert Gordon, of Delmont.	-- barony of Castlerough, lands of Ballybunden, Kilmood, Ballykeagle and Drumreagh.	same - - - -	20
5	Same - - - -	-- Rowland Craig, of Downpatrick.	-- barony of Lecale, lands of Slievenagiddle & Ballyangross.	same - - - -	20
6	Same - - - -	-- The Hon. and Rev. Edw. Chichester, commonly called Lord Edw. Chichester, of Castleupton.	-- barony of Castlerough, lands of Ballynafagh.	same - - - -	20
1	Hillsborough, 17 October 1830.	-- Jas. Green, of Villa -	- barony of Lower Iveagh, lands of Lurginstery.	same - - - -	10
2	Same - - - -	-- John Walth Green, of Woodville.	- barony of Lower Iveagh, lands of Aughmaskoagh.	same - - - -	20
3	Same - - - -	-- Thomas Harshaw, of Lisnacreevy.	-- barony of Newry, lands of Crraha.	same - - - -	20
4	Same - - - -	-- Thos. Osborne Knox, of Benagh.	-- barony of Ards, lands of Upper Killighy.	same - - - -	20
1	Newry, 20 October 1830	-- Chas. James Maffett, of Newry.	- barony of Newry, lands of Grenha and Ooley.	-- the Earl of Kilmorey.	50
1	Downpatrick, 25 October 1830.	-- Robert Waring Maxwell, of Killyfadis.	-- barony of Lecale, lands of Ballybragh, Ballyreilly, Loughfalcon and Lisnemaui.	-- not stated in affidavit of registry.	20
2	Same - - - -	-- Alexander Miller, of Downpatrick.	-- barony of Duffrin, lands of Balloo.	same - - - -	20
3	Same - - - -	-- Patrick John Nugent, of Portlery.	-- barony of Ards, lands of Ballyquinton.	same - - - -	20
4	Same - - - -	-- Charles O'Hara, of O'Hara, Brook, county of Antrim.	- barony of Upper Iveagh, lands of Lisnatery.	same - - - -	20
5	Same - - - -	-- Conway Pilsan, of Downpatrick.	- barony of Lecale, lands of Ballygally.	Ayarworth Pilsan -	20
1	Hillsborough, 5 November 1830.	-- James Miles Relly, of Gardner's-place, Dublin.	- barony of Upper Iveagh, lands of Meccan.	-- not stated in affidavit of registry.	20
2	Same - - - -	-- John Relly, Junior, of Hillsborough.	- barony of Upper Iveagh, lands of Ballygowan.	same - - - -	10
3	Same - - - -	-- John Still, of Comber	-- barony of Castlerough, lands of Comber.	same - - - -	20
1	Newry, 9 November 1833	-- William Glenn Andrews, of Comber.	-- barony of Castlerough, lands of Carnahara.	same - - - -	20
2	Same - - - -	-- Robert Andrews, of Comber.	same - - - -	same - - - -	20
3	Same - - - -	-- Charles Andrews, of Comber.	- barony of Castlerough, lands of Ballyholme and Maryboro.	same - - - -	20
4	Same - - - -	-- Rev. Daniel Biggott, of Newry.	- barony of Newry, lands of Grenha and Ooley.	-- the Earl of Kilmorey.	20

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[101

Number of Bench-charges.	Sessions.	Name and Residence of Person Registered.	Barony and Description of Land on which Bench-charge granted.	Name of Person who granted same.	Amount.
1	Newtownards, 18 June 1833.	-- Hugh Moore, of Nooka, co. of Louth.	-- barony of Ards, lands of Ballywater, Ballyrusley, Ballyatwood, and Whitechurch.	-- Francis Hamill, Thomas Mills and Augusta Sophia Mills, otherwise Hamill, his wife; Francis Maria Hamill, Rev. Henry Stewart and Ann Matilda Stewart, otherwise Hamill, his wife; John Stewart & Harriet Louisa Stewart, otherwise Hamill, his wife, and Robert Hamilton.	£. 50
2	Same - - - -	-- Wm. Moore, of Carrlingford, county Louth.	same - - - -	same - - - -	50
1	Downpatrick, 14 October 1833.	-- John Sharman Crawford, of Crawfordburn.	-- barony of Castlereagh, lands of Creevyrossan.	-- William Sharman Crawford, esq.	50
1	Newry, 21 October 1833	Isaac Carry, of Newry -	-- barony of Upper Iveagh, lands of Moneymore.	Trevor Carry, esq. -	50
1	Downpatrick, 13 October 1834.	-- John Sharman Crawford, of Crawfordburn.	-- barony of Castlereagh, lands of Creevyrossan.	-- William Sharman Crawford, esq.	50
1	Newry, 6 April 1835 -	-- Isaac Ogle Glenn, of Newry.	-- barony of Newry, lands of Ganan, Clouan and Ballynacraig.	-- William Hamilton and Philip Skelton.	50
1	Hillsborough, 29 June 1835.	-- Henry Waring, of Newry.	-- barony of Lower Iveagh, lands of Kilmora.	Thomas Waring -	50
2	Same - - - -	-- Richard Waring, of Newry.	same - - - -	same - - - -	50
1	Downpatrick, 12 October 1835.	-- John Foschall, of Forchill-house, county of Armagh.	-- barony of Castlereagh, lands of Hollywood -	-- Mary Banbury Isaac, widow.	50
1	Newry, 4 April 1836 -	-- Richard Waring, of Newry.	-- barony of Lower Iveagh, lands of Kilmora.	-- not stated in affidavit of registry.	20
2	Same - - - -	-- Henry Waring, of Newry.	same - - - -	same - - - -	50
1	Hillsborough, 27 June 1836.	-- James Forde Graham, of Ballymagrove.	-- barony of Lower Iveagh, lands of Derryberryderry.	same - - - -	20

10 March 1837.

J. & R. Craig, Clerks of the Peace.

COUNTY OF THE TOWN OF DROGHEDA.

Sessions when Registered.	Name and Residence of Person Registered.	Barony and Description of Land on which the Charge was granted.	Name of the Person granting Charge.	Charge of 20 l.	Charge of 50 l.
First sessions under Reform Act, 8th Nov. 1832.	Jas. Gilmore, Dundalk	Houses in West-street, town of Drogheda.	James Schoobles -	none	one.

15 March 1837.

Josh. Holmes, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF DUBLIN.

Name.	Residence.	Barony.	Division of Land.	£. s.	£. ss.	Date of Registry.
				Revd- charge.	Revd- charge.	
Daly, Samuel Allen -	Warburgh-street -	Coolock -	Dalymount -	-	1	17 Oct. 1832.
Hamilton, Thomas C.	Hampton -	Balrothery -	Balbriggan -	1	-	11 - -
Jackson, Joseph -	Windy Harbour -	Rathdown -	Clarkstown -	-	1	23 - -
Murray, George Wm.	Mountjoy-square -	ditto -	Costonly -	-	1	15 - -
McGulness, Nicholas	Stephens-street -	Uppercross -	Cullen -	-	1	16 - -
Proby, Hon. G. L. -	Glensad Castle, co. Wicklow.	Rathdown -	Czwickmines -	1	-	18 - -
Shaw, Robert -	Bushy Park -	Newcastle -	Tecmore -	1	-	20 - -
Thompson, Geo. Clerk	Grassard, co. Longford	Castlesock -	Hollywoodmth -	1	-	23 - -
Butler, John -	Glasnevin-road -	Rathdown -	Roebuck -	-	1	8 Nov. -
Crotty, Cornelius -	New-row -	Castlesock -	Diovellstown -	1	-	7 - -
Dixon, Theoph. Jones	Nelson-street -	Rathdown -	Bloomsberry -	-	1	9 - -
Dillon, Edward -	York-street -	Castlesock -	Ballybeck -	-	1	16 - -
Graydon, James N.	Porobello -	Newcastle -	Ballytown -	-	1	20 Oct. -
Kirk, George -	Rocestown -	Rathdown -	Rocestown -	1	-	14 Nov. -
Latouche, David C.	Marley -	ditto -	Clarkstown -	1	-	14 - -
O'Hara, Patterson	York-street -	Coolock -	Fairview -	-	1	6 - -
Flunkett, Oliver -	North Great George's- street.	ditto -	St. Margaret's -	1	-	14 - -
Woodcock, Richard -	Rathmas -	Rathdown -	Kingstown -	1	-	8 - -
Wolk, John -	North Frederick street	Coolock -	Dunacoughley -	-	1	14 - -
Wilson, William -	Johnstown House -	ditto -	Drumcondra -	-	1	18 - -
Galway, John -	North Cumberland- street.	Uppercross -	Tipperkevin -	-	1	17 June 1835.
Brown, Robert C.	Brown's-hill, co. Carlow	Newcastle -	Palmerstown -	1	-	19 - 1834.
Dimey, Thomas -	Westland-row -	Nethercross -	Little Ballygall -	-	1	8 April 1835.
Grovet, Samuel -	Clons -	Castlesock -	Scribblestown -	-	1	8 - -
Hamilton, Henry -	Ballynacoll -	Balrothery -	Holmpatrick -	-	1	20 - -
Mansell, John -	Osley Park -	Uppercross -	Carrinstown -	-	1	9 - -
Mansell, Geo. Woods	ditto -	ditto -	ditto -	-	1	9 - -
Woods, Hena Hamilton	Milverton -	Balrothery -	Ballybeghill -	-	1	9 - -
Baker, Thomas -	Corduff -	ditto -	Courtdough -	-	1	8 - 1835.
Duncan, Nugent B.	Finglass -	Newcastle -	Mullensgrove -	-	1	8 Jan. -
Duncan, James F.	ditto -	ditto -	ditto -	-	1	8 - -
McDonnell, Edward	Merrion-square -	Coolock -	Robbawalls -	-	1	9 - -
Rathbone, Henry -	Scribblestown -	Castlesock -	Scribblestown -	-	1	9 - -
McMahon, Beresford B.	Fortfield -	Uppercross -	Templeogue -	1	-	8 April -
Fegan, James -	Bridgfoot-street -	ditto -	Cullinstern -	1	-	8 - -
Hitchell, Ebenzer -	Holles-street -	Donore -	Roper's Rest -	-	1	8 Jan. -
Hamilton, Rev. Henry	Thomastown Glebe -	Castlesock -	Dunestown -	-	1	8 April -
Johnson, William	Ardenode -	Uppercross -	Ardenode -	-	1	7 Jan. 1837.
Waldron, Lawrence -	Rathgar -	Newcastle -	Little Newtown -	-	1	7 - -
				12	27	

COUNTY OF FERMANAGH.

Name of Person Registered.	Residence.	Barony.	Description of Land on which granted.	Name of Person granting same.	Value	Value	Session at which Registered.
Hon. Arthur Henry Cole.	Florence-court	Knockerinny	- - Malles, Killygrath, Kibbickelly, Kinnear and Kilarany.	Earl of Enniskillen	£ 50	-	Oct. sess. 1832.
North. Steel McConell.	Drumgown	- ditto -	- Corradower, Congh, Coarntown, Crulstown, Derrybrick, Derrymacarty, Drumilly, Gartera, Kibbickelly, Killegrath, Killecranny, Kinnear, Leggin, Mullice and Trana.	Earl of Enniskillen	50	-	ditto.
Paul Duce	Killyhevlin	Magherasheen	Tullyvilly & Drummarat	Richard Duce, esq.	-	20	ditto.
Hon. Arthur Henry Cole.	Florence-court	Glenawly	Lillickerick	- - W. Willoughby Cole, called Lt. Vic. Cole.	50	-	ditto.
John D. Johnston	Weeden, England.	Tyrconnedy	Snowhill	- - J. D. Johnston, esq., sen.	-	50	ditto.
E. Gosford Johnston	Snowhill	- ditto -	Redhenny	J. D. Johnston, esq.	-	50	ditto.
Edward Barton	Clannelly	Long	Drumgowna	William Barton, esq.	-	50	ditto.
J. Armstrong Deering	Derrybrusk	Magherahey	Drumscollap	John Deering, esq.	-	50	ditto.
William Richmond	Tonyatick	Tyrconnedy	- Latten, Shalinassee, Doon and Lemm.	Isabella Richmond	-	50	East. sess. 1833.
C. J. Coleman Jones	Rushien	Glenawly	Trellick	Charles Jones, esq.	-	50	Sum. sess. 1834.
Edward Duce, Jun.	Killyhevlin	Magherasheen	Drummarat & Toneyvilly	Richard Duce, esq.	-	50	Oct. sess. 1834.
Hon. J. Henry Cole	Florence-court	Glenawly	Lillickerick	- - W. Willoughby Cole, called Lt. Vic. Cole.	-	50	Hil. sess. 1835.
John Roddy	Clones, county Monaghan.	Clankelly	Salsan and Carrigan	William Roddy	-	50	East. sess. 1835.
Thomas Brooke, 1st Baron.	Enniskillen	Magherasheen	Tattenboghagh	Sir A. B. Brooke	-	50	Oct. sess. 1835.
G. F. Brooke, Jun.	Natfield	- ditto -	Tyranny	Sir A. B. Brooke	-	50	Hil. sess. 1836.
W. Ardwick Duce	Killyhevlin	- ditto -	Toneyvilly & Drummarat.	Richard Duce, esq.	-	50	East. sess. 1836.
Robert Farnet	Lisboin	Knockrury	Com and Derryvan	Charles Farnet, esq.	-	50	Oct. sess. 1836.
Joseph Richardson	Lesterkeem	Clankelly	Dunaco	Rev. J. Richardson	-	50	Hil. sess. 1836-7.
John Richardson	- ditto -	- ditto -	Aughnasquill	Rev. J. Richardson	-	50	ditto.
Total	- - 19.						

Adm. Nixon, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF GALWAY.

Name and Residence.	Session when Registered.	Barony and Description of Land.	Name of the Grantor.	£ 2s.	£ 2s.
William Hartley Hodson, of Tooloohane, esq.	Loughrea, 13 Jan. 1836	- - Fehannagh, Tooloohane, Lysegan and Clooskonee, and barony of Atheryn.	- - H. Hodson, of Tooloohane, esq.	£ -	£ 50
Robert Rodkin, of Anna, esq.	Tusm, 3 Nov. 1832	Anna, and barony Clare	John Rodkin, esq., Anna	-	50
Edward Kelly, Ballymac	Tusm, 3 Nov. 1832	Koolagsee, barony Ballymac	Chas. Kelly, of Ballymac	20	-
John Rodkin, of Tusm, esq.	Tusm, 3 Nov. 1832	Ballybanagher, barony Clare	J. Nolan, of Ballybanagher	20	-
The Hon. and Rev. Nicholas French, Castle French.	Ballinasloe, 8 Nov. 1832	Ballinliss, and barony of Killyan	Lt. French, Castle French	-	50
Stapley, St. George, esq., of Delphi.	Tusm, 3 Nov. 1832	Headford, barony Clare	R. J. M. St. George, esq.	-	50
James Daly, of Castle Daly, esq.	Gort, 17 Oct. 1832	Ballyhasard, barony Killarlan	P. Daly, esq., Castle Daly	-	50
Charles W. Lophole, esq., Ennervic.	Gort, 17 Oct. 1832	- - Duara and Kintarra, barony of Killarlan.	John Lophole, esq., Gort	20	-
Thomas Tully, esq., Refrara	Loughrea, 13 Oct. 1832	Annolady, barony of Leitrim	Thos. Tully, esq., Refrara	50	-
James Steffington Daly, esq., Dunsandle.	Ballinasloe, 8 Nov. 1832	Dunsandle, barony Loughrea	Jas. Daly, esq., Dunsandle	-	50
H. Hodson, of Tooloohane Lodge	Ballinasloe, 8 Nov. 1832	Tooloohane, barony of Loughrea	W. Hodson, of Tooloohane, esq.	20	-
Amesley Eyre, esq., Lieutenant in 7th regiment of foot.	Eyrecoart, 10 Oct. 1832	Killarlan, barony of Longford	- - grantor not named in affidavit.	20	-
J. Carr, of Loughrea, clerk	Loughrea, 27 Dec. 1832	Ballygarr, barony of Loughrea	Hycynth Daly, esq., Reford	50	-
M. de Donnetie, esq., Ramoet	Tusm, 25 Jan. 1837	Mountrass, barony Clare	grantor not named	-	50
Edm. B. Handcock, of Rodmoyle House, Queen's Co.	Tusm, 5 Jan. 1836	Carrintrially, barony of Dunmore	- - Wm. Handcock, esq.	-	50

James Kelly, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF THE TOWN OF GALWAY.

No.	Name of Beneficiary.	Residence.	Barony and Description of Land on which Rentsharge granted.	Amount of Rentsharge.	Date of Registration.
1	James Campbell	-- No. 15, New Cavendish-street, Portland-place, London.	-- Knocknacree, Farnoreen, Co. Wick, and Lachenby, West Liberties.	£ 50	10 Oct. 1832.
2	James Lynch	High-street, Galway	Flood-street, Galway	20	10 --
3	Daniel McNevin	-- Middle Gardiner-street, Dublin.	Leopard-street	20	10 --
4	James McDonogh	-- Merchant's-road, Galway.	-- New-road & Nuns' Island.	50	10 --
5	Michael McDonogh	-- ditto	-- ditto	50	10 --

Note.—There is no record in the clerk of the peace's office of the name of the person by whom the rentscharge was granted.

Galway, 4 March 1837.

J. M. O'Hara,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF KERRY.

Date.	No.	Name and Residence of each Person Registered.	Barony.	Description of Land on which Charge was granted.	Name of Person granting the same.	£ 50 Rentsharge.	£ 100 Rentsharge.
1832: 10 October	1	Richard Burke, Knocknashigh	Clanmaurice	-- Glanbeigh and Ballymanagh.	--	£	£
16 --	2	Charles F. Nash, Ballycarthy	Treghensackny	Ballycarthy	The Rev. E. Nash	50	100
17 --	3	John Neligan, Tralee	--	Ballygarraun	--	50	100
17 --	4	Denis McCarthy, jun., Rathree	Magonilly	Doonishoon	--	50	100
18 --	5	Morgan J. O'Connell, Gremagh	Clanmaurice	Tubrinore	--	50	100
20 --	6	-- The Rev. Francis C. Sandes, Sallowglen.	Irraghticonnor	Glacatough	--	50	100
20 --	7	Stephen C. Sandes, Sallowglen	--	Carrinabilly	--	50	100
20 --	8	Maurice F. Sandes, Sallowglen	--	Glincolline	--	50	100
20 --	9	David G. Thompson, Tralee	Treghensackny	Ballingbragh	--	50	100
22 --	10	Francis H. Downing, Kenmare	Glanerough	Kenmare	Eugene Downing	50	100
25 --	11	James F. Bland, Parknasilla	Dunkerron	-- Dirlieigh and Coomenna.	Francis C. Bland	50	100
25 --	12	Peter Berry, Killarney	Magonilly	Lisivane & Laham	Daniel Lawlor	50	100
25 --	13	Charles Brennan, Sundaywell	--	Mastergishy	--	50	100
25 --	14	Pierce Crosbie, Ballyheue Castle	Clanmaurice	-- Ballyvase and Clandermies.	--	50	100
27 --	15	John Leahy, jun., South Hill	Corkaquinney	-- Reenvarck and Killfermoge.	--	50	100
29 --	16	Richard Huggard, Tralee	Magonilly	-- Ballymalisla and Ballyhar.	James R. Eagar	50	100
1 Nov.	17	Therbold Spotswood, Rockgrove	Iveragh	Carobeg and Bry	John Spotswood	50	100
1 --	18	Daniel O'Sullivan, Tonies	Dunkerron	Dirivobena	--	50	100
1 --	19	John Thompson, Rockfield	Magonilly	Shroon	--	50	100
13 --	20	Thomas F. Nelligan, Tralee	Iveragh	-- Portmagee, Reen, Carragh, Carranetreen, Doonaghderreen.	John Nelligan	50	100
13 --	21	Pierce Chute, jun., Tralee	Treghensackny	Ballyroe	--	50	100
13 --	22	Thomas Chute, Plymth	--	Knockmish	--	50	100
13 --	23	The Rev. E. McCarthy, Killarney	Magonilly	College	--	50	100
15 --	24	F. W. Mallins, Beaufort-house	--	Ballymalisla	The Hon. F. Mallins	50	100
25 --	25	Eugene McCarthy, Rathree	--	Dooneshon	--	50	100
25 --	26	William D. Godfrey, Killcolman	Treghensackny	Ballingamboon	--	50	100
1833: 28 June	27	Patrick Divise, Tralee	--	Clashspooks	Edward Denny	50	100
28 --	28	Robert Benner, Tralee	--	Tralee	Samuel Benner	50	100
28 October	29	John Hussey, Dingle	--	Thursalough	Peter B. Hussey	50	100
30 Dec.	30	David Fitzgerald, Glanlien	Iveragh	Glanlien	-- The Right hon. Maurice Fitzgerald.	50	100

Date.	No.	Name and Residence of each Person Registered.	Barony.	Denomination of Land on which the Charge was granted.	Name of Person granting same.	£.50 Re-charge.	£.20 Re-charge.
1835						£.	£.
17 March	31	Richard Clute, Spring Hill	Trillickroney	Mullingbarkly	Francis Clute	50	-
7 April	32	Richard Clute, Tralee	- same	Shoopwalk	Richard Clute	-	50
-	33	William Thompson, Tinsloe	- same	Chobers	Peter Thompson	-	50
13 Jan	34	John Mahony, Killarney	Dunkerron	Carrabeg	- Sir Arthur Bp. Hassett.	50	-
13 July	35	Nahusy Harro, Coolrus	Magonihy	- Coolroo, Coolbane and Naunturano.	Mrs. Marlan Harro	50	-
-	36	Peter Fitzgerald, Ballinraddery	Iveragh	Glanleam	- The Right hon. Maurice Fitzgerald.	-	50
-	37	Edward Murphy, Kilowen	Magonihy	- Aglish and Trip-pennygh.	Richard Murphy	-	50
18 Dec.	38	Richard Leaty, South-hill	- same	- Crostown and Coolighban.	John Leaty	50	-
1835:							
11 April	39	Wm M. Hickson, Dagh Globe	Clonsarico	Kilmore	- The Rev. Robt. Hickson.	-	50
13 October	40	Robert A. Thompson, Tralee	Trillickroney	Caltraclean	Peter Thompson	-	50

Not.—The documents in the possession of the clerk of the peace in some cases do not state the names of the persons granting the recharges.

J. Credit, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF KILDARE.

Date when Registered.	Name.	Residence.	Barony.	Denominations.	Name of the Person granting same.	Amount.	
						£.50.	£.20.
Nov. 10 October 1835	- Wm. T. Armstrong.	- Slade-more, co. Dublin.	South Nass	Grangerson	- not mentioned in affidavit.	50	-
Do - - - -	Hurvey Cassidy	Monastereran	Kilculin	Kilculin	- ditto	50	-
Do - - - -	- Rev. W. C. Roberts.	Sallymount	- ditto	Killinan	- Rev. John C. Roberts.	50	-
Maynooth, 20 Oct.	Dillon M'Namara	City of Dublin	Clare	Czagh	John Hagan	50	-
Do - - - -	John J. Pomeroy	Bohangan	Carbery	- Castlecreebery and Hollyghbin.	- not mentioned in affidavit.	50	-
Nov. 15 October	Mathew Brett	City of Dublin	North Salt	Carbellin	Thos. J. Nicholls	-	50
Nov. 15 November	- Marmaduke C. C. Roberts.	Sallymount	Kilculin	Kilgorna	- Rev. John C. Roberts.	50	-
Maynoth, 21 Nov.	James Ledwith	City of Dublin	Carbery	Kilratherry	- Rev. Edward Ledwith.	-	50
Maynoth, 30 June 1835	Robert C. Browne	- Brownhill, co. Carlow.	North Salt	Dooanempur	Wm. Browne	50	-
Do - 5 Jan. 1836	- Chas. W. Hamilton.	- Hazwood, co. Meath.	- ditto	Knockmullree	Chas. Hamilton	-	50
Nov. 11 April	Chas. G. Palmer	Rahon	Carbery	Ballyhagan	- Rev. Charles Palmer.	-	50
Maynoth, 27 June	James Kilbee	Woodenbridge, co. Wicklow.	South Nass	Canycourt	William Kilbee	-	50
Nov. 17 October	Edward Colgan	Kilcock	Heathy	Kilcock	John Colgan	-	50
Do - - - -	John Kelly	City of Dublin	Carbery	- Kilsurry, Kishanoo, & Danferth.	- Rev. J. Darcy, Sarah Darcy, & Margaret Fleming.	-	50
Do - - - -	Robert Bourke	- Hayes, co. Meath.	North Nass	Palmerstown	- John Earl of Mayo.	-	50

George Medlicott,
Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF KILKENNY.

No.	Name of Person.	Residence.	Barony and Description of Land on which the Charge was granted.	Name of Person granting the Charge.	£5s.	£4s.	Date of Registry.
1	Wm. T. Bockey	-- Derrybawn, county Wicklow.	-- Gowran, lands of Lower Grange.	- not mentioned in affidavit.	1	-	18 Oct. 1831.
2	Bernard W. Delany	Durrow - - -	Galway, lands of Barnfields -	Wm. Delany -	-	1	-
3	Edw. S. Delany	ditto - - -	ditto - lands of Durrow -	ditto -	-	1	-
4	Pat. D. Delany	Ballyspellan - -	ditto - lands of Ballyspellan -	George Delany -	-	1	-
5	Emmasl M. Fitzpatrick.	Uringford - - -	ditto - lands of Uringford -	John Fitzpatrick -	-	1	-
6	Thomas Fogarty	Featherd, co. Wexford	Ida, lands of Kilmash -	- not mentioned in affidavit.	1	-	-
7	Wm. O. Leech	City Kilkenny -	Gowran, lands of Kildery -	George Leech -	-	1	13 Oct. -
8	John Malin	- ditto - - -	Cranagh, lands of Boatstown -	Joana Kavanagh -	1	-	-
9	John McCreath	- ditto - - -	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	-	1	-
10	Rev. Ben. Morris	- ditto - - -	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	-	1	-
11	Wm. H. Hunt	Jerpoint - - -	Knocktopher, lands of Jerpoint	Rev. E. Hunt -	1	-	-
12	Michael Cormick	- - - - - - - - -	Kells, lands of Cusmore -	- not mentioned in affidavit.	-	1	10 Oct. -
13	Richard Morris	Curkwa - - -	Iverk, lands of Cashil -	John Blackmore -	-	1	-
14	Franc. Conzard	- - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - -	Thos. Waring -	-	1	3 Nov. -
15	Thos. Bradly	City of Kilkenny -	Fassadineen, lands of Borris -	John Shearman -	-	1	-
16	Henry Baker	Kilcrean - - -	Shillelagh, lands of Kilcrean -	John Baker -	1	-	-
17	Arthur Baker	- Captain of 3d Dragoons, Glasgow.	ditto - - - ditto -	ditto - - -	1	-	-
18	John Hamfrey	Clay Kilkenny -	Fassadineen, lands of Killocollin	Christ. Hamfrey	-	1	-
19	John Wolfe	Arran Quay, Dublin	Gowran, lands of Clofooke -	John Wolfe -	1	-	24 June 1833.
20	Rev. W. C. Roberts.	Glassewin, co. Dublin	Shillelagh, lands of Boshanna.	- Rev. John C. Roberts.	1	-	16 Oct. -
21	Stephen Wright	Faulkath - - -	Fassadineen, lands of Faulkath -	- Meade N. Stone, & Simeon Clark.	1	-	31 Mar. 1833.
22	Thos. N. Wright	- ditto - - -	ditto - - - ditto -	ditto - - -	-	1	-
23	Clayton Bayly	- - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - -	Wm. Bayly -	-	1	8 April -
24	Hon. John Earl of Ossory.	- - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - -	-	1	-
25	John G. H. Mulholland.	- - - - - - - - -	Gowran, lands of Castlehill -	Robt. Mulholland	-	1	-
26	Mother O'Donnell	City of Kilkenny -	Cranagh, lands of Mount Eagle	Rich. O'Donnell	-	1	20 Oct. -
27	Andw. O'Donnell	- ditto - - -	ditto - - - ditto -	ditto - - -	-	1	-
28	Michael Magan	Curraghboy - -	Gowran, lands of Curraghboy -	John Kelly -	-	1	29 Oct. -
29	Christ. Hamfrey	City of Kilkenny -	Fassadineen, lands of Killocollin	C. Hamfrey, sen.	-	1	5 Jan. 1834.
30	Loreano N. Inad	Chapel Inad - -	Kells, lands of Trewan -	Wm. Inad -	1	-	15 Jan. -
31	Thomas J. Fitzgerald.	- - - - - - - - -	Iverk, lands of Luffany -	Thos. Fitzgerald	1	-	7 April -
					14	17	

John Frost, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF THE CITY OF KILKENNY.

—	Number of Rent-charges registered at each Session since 1 Qrs. 1831.	Name and Residence of each Person so Registered.	Barony and Description of Land on which the Charge was granted.	Name of the Person granting the same.	£5s.	£4s.	
Oct. 1830	1	William Bayly, jun., of Nore-lands, in the county of Kilkenny, esq.	- - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - -	-	-	20
	2	James Keen, of Blackmill-street, in said county.	- - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - -	-	-	20
	3	John Scott, of Beatenstown, in the co. of Dublin, esq.	- - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - -	-	-	20
Oct. 1833	1	Walter Cramer Roberts, clerk, of Glassewin, in the county Dublin.	- - - - - - - - -	- - - - - - - - -	-	-	20

No person registered as a rent-charger in the county of the city of Kilkenny in the years 1834, 1835 or 1836.

28 February 1837.

Patrick Walters, Clerk of the Peace.

KING'S COUNTY.

Name and Residence of Person Registered.	Demonstration of Land on which the Charge was granted.	Name of Person granting Charge.	Amount of Exchange Registered.	Place and Date of Registry.
BALLYBRITT BARONY:				
Nicholas Biddulph, Kingsborough	- Agovely alias Ballinately.	- - Lady Elizabeth Waller.	50 - -	Birr, 2 April 1835.
Michael Head Drought, Harristown, Queen's County.	- - Lettybrook, Killmacuddy, Lacerrow & Munny.	- - - -	50 - -	- - 6 November 1832.
John Head Drought, Lettybrook	- - Lettybrook alias Curraghbeg.	- - - -	20 - -	- - same.
Francis Freman, jun., Summerhill	- - - -	- - - -	20 - -	Philippstown, 7 Nov. 1832.
Henry Good, Charlemount	- - - -	- - - -	20 - -	- - same.
Robert Hackett, Elmgrove	- - Cheshelly	- - Mich. Hackett	50 - -	Birr, 18 October 1831.
Simpson Hackett, Elmgrove	- - Clonbeg alias Cappanare.	- - Mich. Hackett	50 - -	- - same.
Isaac Hackett, Elmgrove	- - - -	- - Mich. Hackett	50 - -	- - same.
George Hackett, Elmgrove	- - Parsonstown	- - - -	20 - -	- - same.
Thomas Hackett, Elmgrove	- - Parsonstown	- - - -	50 - -	- - 10 October 1831.
George Heenan	- - - -	- - John Heenan	50 - -	- - 25 October 1831.
Edmond Neasa Kelly, Parsonstown	- - Parsonstown	- - - -	20 - -	- - 20 October 1831.
Charles Kelly, Birr	- - - -	- - - -	20 - -	- - same.
Michael Madden, Parsonstown	- - Birr	- - - -	20 - -	- - 6 November 1832.
Leed Oxmantown, Birr Castle	- - Birr	- - - -	50 - -	- - 26 October 1831.
Rev. Thomas Walker, Roscrea, county Tipperary.	- - Ahody	- - Jas. Walker	50 - -	- - 29 June 1836.
BALLYBOY BARONY:				
George Holles, Frankford	- - Barnabor, Killnegall and Ballintoughed, Garbally	- - Thos. Holles	50 - -	- - 17 October 1832.
John Hoy, Banagher	- - - -	- - - -	20 - -	- - 19 October 1831.
Henry Richard Kennis, Melton-square, Dublin	- - Derryduhney	- - Henry Kennis	20 - -	- - 27 October 1835.
Daniel Marfield, junior, Cadanstown.	- - Killgalan & Knockhill.	- - - -	20 - -	Tullamore, 24 Oct. 1831.
John Marfield, Cadanstown	- - Killgalan & Knockhill.	- - - -	20 - -	- - same.
William Piggot, junior, Upper Dominick-street, Dublin.	- - Belliver and Ballinacraig.	- - H. D. Piggot	50 - -	Birr, 29 June 1835.
BALLYWOWEN BARONY:				
Benjamin J. Kearney, Kouraville	- - Tullamore	- - Rich. Kearney	20 - -	Philippstown, 21 June 1831.
Arthur Mcley, Drumcood-lodge, county Westmeath.	- - Corndare	- - Bernard Mcley	20 - -	- - 2 January 1833.
Alexander McMulken, Tullamore	- - Tullamore	- - G. McMulken	20 - -	- - 20 Dec. 1835.
Thomas Robert Hurd, Wetherell, Parsonstown.	- - Ballybrannick and Castleown.	- - J. Wetherell	20 - -	- - 23 June 1835.
CLONLISE BARONY.				
John Andrew, Firmount	- - Rathery	- - - -	20 - -	Tullamore, 30 Oct. 1832.
Mazwell Henry Andrew, Firmount.	- - Clonlisk	- - - -	20 - -	Birr, 17 November 1832.
Daniel Ashton, Woodfield	- - Ballietoria, Coolree, Clares, Mecklone, Killcommon, Rushed, and Clonfid.	- - John Ashton	20 - -	- - 27 October 1835.
George Byrne, junior, Shirone	- - Corclanty	- - John Keeshan & Mary Keeshan.	20 - -	- - 9 January 1833.
Thomas Doolan, junior, Wingfield, county Tipperary.	- - Derry and Killfranch	- - - -	20 - -	- - 6 November 1831.
Francis Lucas, Brussa	- - Brussa	- - Wm. Lucas	20 - -	- - 25 October 1831.
Henry Smith, junior, Clareen	- - Leipse and Maugheragh.	- - - -	20 - -	Tullamore, 29 Oct. 1831.
Ralph Smith, Clareen	- - Leipse and Maugheragh.	- - - -	20 - -	- - same.
Thomas Woods, Killagee	- - Keelouge	- - - -	20 - -	Birr, 3 November 1831.
Joseph James Walker, Belfield	- - Belfield alias Moy-hornore.	- - Jas. Walker	20 - -	- - 2 April 1836.

(continued)

Name and Residence of Person Registered.	Description of Land on which the Charge was granted.	Name of Person granting Charge.	Amount of Mortgage Registered.	Date, and Date of Expiry.
COOLGOWAN BARONY:			£. s. d.	
James Scott Molloy, Capel-street, Dublin.	Clonsast - - -	Celia Molloy -	50 - -	Philipstown, 23 June 1836.
Rev. Thomas Pursey, Bannagher -	Clonbullock - - -	- - - -	50 - -	Birr, 17 November 1836.
ENGLISH BARONY:				
Rev. Philip Berry, Bachelor's Hall, county Cork.	Cloncan - - -	- Thomas Sterling Berry.	20 - -	Tullamore, 16 Oct. 1832.
Thomas Berry, Home-st., Dublin	Cloncan - - -	- Thomas Sterling Berry.	20 - -	Birr, 12 November 1832.
Harvey Cassidy, Monasterereen, county Kildare.	- Killyonias Streamstown.	- - - -	20 - -	- - 13 October 1832.
Revt. Cassidy, Jamestown, Queen's County.	Killyon - - -	John Cassidy	50 - -	Tullamore, 26 Oct. 1832.
Thomas Hunt Cross, Glinck Cottage.	Woodfield - - -	- - - -	20 - -	Birr, 5 November 1832.
Henry Drought, Heath Lodge - -	- - Balliver, Ballinacorey & Upper Cough.	- - - -	50 - -	- - 26 October 1832.
Edward Drought, Droughville - -	- - Balliver, Ballinacorey & Upper Cough.	- - - -	50 - -	- - same.
Joseph Robinson, Birr - - -	Carraghmore - - -	J. Robinson -	20 - -	- - 17 November 1832.
GARRYGATLE BARONY:				
John Head Burdett, Glabe, Bannagher.	- - Cashallow alias Cloncalow.	John Burdett	20 - -	- - 2 January 1837.
Arthur Michael Burdett, Glabe, Bannagher.	- - Mullighans alias Mullighans.	John Burdett	20 - -	- - same.
Thomas Cudshan, Ashgrove - -	- - Mc'Nahany and Coogarriff.	- - - -	20 - -	- - 1 November 1832.
John W. F. Drought, Creggan, county Westmeath	Belmunt - - -	- - G. Meares, John Drought.	50 - -	- - 5 November 1832.
Henry Fry, Frybooke, county Roscommon.	Park - - - -	- - W. Baker Fry and Henry Fry.	20 - -	- - 1 November 1832.
Henry Fry, Jun., Frybooke, county Roscommon.	Park - - - -	- - - -	20 - -	- - 5 November 1832.
Anthony Hoene, Ferbane - - -	Lebog - - - -	Jana. Hoone	20 - -	- - 9 October 1832.
Thomas Hackett, Puseenstown - -	Ballinacougher	- Simpson Hackett	20 - -	- - 27 October 1832.
John Hought, Leader, Moydere -	Moydere - - -	- Robert Lauder	20 - -	- - 25 October 1836.
Thomas Ryan, Tullamore - - -	Ballycure - - -	John Hoone -	20 - -	- - 1 January 1837.
KILCOURNEY BARONY:				
Ambrose Cox, South-hill, county Dublin.	Clara - - - -	Ambrose Cox	20 - -	Tullamore, 16 Oct. 1832.
Owen Colgan, Denovan, county Westmeath.	- - Big Ballinacill and Killmally.	Samuel Meore	50 - -	- - 10 Nov. 1832.
UPPER PHILIPSTOWN BARONY:				
Bernard Fitzpatrick, Portarlington, Queen's County.	Meovana - - -	William Poole	50 - -	Philipstown, 8 Nov. 1832.
Rev. Charles Vignoles, Comaller, county Westmeath.	Ballintogher - - -	- - the trustees named in the Act of the 11th year of the reign of King William the Third, and the Rev. Father in God, William Lord Bishop of Kildare.	20 - -	Birr, 16 November 1832.
Rev. William Warburton, Garryinch.	Borrounoughs	- - - -	20 - -	Tullamore, 30 Oct. 1832.
Henry Warburton, Garryinch - -	Cloneyhark - - -	- - - -	20 - -	- - same.
James Warburton, Garryinch - -	Cloneyhark - - -	- - - -	20 - -	- - same.

I cannot give the name of the person granting the remittance of those who were merely registered under the 2 & 3 Will. 4, c. 88, as, till the passing of that Act, the form of affidavit did not require the name of the grantor to be inserted.

Robert Harding, Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF LEITRIM.

No.	NAMES.	Residence.	Barony.	Description of Land on which the Charge was granted.	Name of the Person granting the same.	Whether		Date of the Session at which they were registered.
						£. 50.	£. 20.	
1	The Hon. Robert B. Clements.	Kiladoon, county Kildare.	Roslogher, Drumshair.	-- Fougery, Brookmore, Cornacree, Ram Park, Paddock and Rushey Hill, and tenements and premises in the town of Moorhamilton and Sireeny West.	-- The Earl of Leitrim.	£.	£.	12 Oct. 1832.
2	The Hon. W. S. Clements.	Capt. 43d regiment foot.	- same -	- - same - -	- same -	-	50	12 Oct. 1832.
3	Michael Jones	Lisgoole Abbey, county Fermanagh.	Carrigallen	- Anghin, Anaghshelton, Buggane, Drum-bibe, Ballinmedlague, Carraboyher, Carrabohar, Derryvanon, Derrinshiltubeg, Geagh-shappa, Geaghrove, Carrarne and Mullinashlagh.	Margaret Jones	-	50	17 Oct. 1832.
4	The Hon. Charles S. Clements.	Lieut. 57th regiment foot.	Roslogher, Drumshair.	- Fougery, Brookmore, Cornacree, Ram Park, Paddock, Rushey Hill and Sireeny West, and tenements and premises in the town of Moorhamilton.	-- The Earl of Leitrim.	-	50	17 Oct. 1832.
5	Duke Crofton	Lakefield	Mohill	Cornaff	- grantor not named in affidavit.	-	50	21 Oct. 1832.
6	Thos. Jas. Norris	Mohill	Mohill	- Deimughy, Liede Drumby and Drumlowen.	- same	-	50	21 Oct. 1832.
7	James Keen	Keelogue	Leitrim	Anaghshelmersey	- same	-	50	21 Oct. 1832.
8	The Rev. John Lloyd.	Smith Hill, co. Roscommon.	Mohill	Drangilla	- same	-	20	5 Nov. 1832.
9	William L. Slack	Mount Prospect	Leitrim	- Carricklarin, Gortbarnagh and Drumceag.	- same	-	20	5 Nov. 1832.
10	John E. Cullen	Sireeny	Roslogher	Derryloughan	- Jno. McCullen, esq.	-	50	17 Oct. 1832.
11	Theophilus B. Jones	Drumiffin	Mohill	Drumard	- The Rev. T. Jones.	-	50	2 April 1833.
12	John Goodfellow	Lismore Lodge	Leitrim	Tullymanon	- Jas. Dickson	-	50	15 Oct. 1832.
13	John Robt. Godley	Killigar	Carrigallen	Drumbengour	- Jno. Godley, esq.	-	50	7 April 1833.
14	The Hon. F. N. Clements.	Kiladoon, county Kildare.	Drumshair	Moorhamilton	- The Earl of Leitrim.	50	-	23 June 1833.
15	The Hon. G. R. A. Clements.	- same -	- same -	- - same - -	- same -	50	-	23 June 1833.
16	Wm. James Armstrong.	Shalemore Lodge, county Dublin.	Mohill	- Atheshinshin, Clonsbry, Clonsuck, Mansbridge and Carriskey.	- The Earl of Gerard.	50	-	30 June 1833.
17	Robert Johnston Gore.	Cossy, co. Carrigallen	Carrigallen	- Woodfield and Derrinagga.	- The Rev. W. Gore.	50	-	17 Oct. 1832.

Peace Office,
Carrick-on-Shannon, 23 March 1837.

Alexander Jarvis, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF LIMERICK.

Session.	Number Registered.	Name and Residence of Person Registered.	Land on which Charged.	Survey.	Name of the Person granting.	Amount.
1st	1	James Barry, Standville	- - Breace, Gossoue, Knockferna and Monnerikien.	Upper Connelloe	There is no notice taken of the person's name who grants a release, nor does the name of the grantor appear in the affidavits, which is the only source from which such information could be ascertained.	£. 50
---	2	Edward J. Green, Greenmount	Ballybane	ditto		50
---	3	Daniel Hamett, Knockbrack	Knockbrack	ditto		50
---	4	Richard Mason, Cappinhouse	Cappinhouse	ditto		50
---	5	Thomas O'Keegan, Mount Earl	Cappanantey	ditto		50
---	6	James Quinlan, city of Limerick	Gortree	ditto		50
---	7	Robert J. Stevely, Glanduff	- - Carnard and Ros-sierpane.	ditto		50
---	8	Gerald Blennerhassett, jun., Riddlestown	Riddlestown	Lower Connelloe		50
---	9	Robert K. D'Esteire, Limerick	- ditto -	ditto		50
---	10	Lake Ferguson, Shanagolden	- - Shanagolden and Mount David.	ditto		50
---	11	George M. Mounsell, city of Dublin	Ballywilliam	ditto		50
---	12	Jeremiah Earight, Shan Pallas	New Island	Kesey		50
---	13	Henry Watson, Limerick	Ballyvoeregue	ditto		50
---	14	John Cuthbert, ditto	Curnas	Cashma		50
---	15	Patrick O'Flaherty, Cross	Duharrow	ditto		50
---	16	George Rackle, Kilgobbin	Kilgobbin	ditto		50
---	17	Christopher Adamson, Ballinallick	Kilrampin	Pabike Brien		50
---	18	William Mossell, Terroe	Terroe	ditto		50
---	19	Jeremiah O'Sullivan, Limerick	Garryne	ditto		50
---	20	William Sadler, Shronehill	Ballyvolode	Small County		50
---	21	Rev. W. M. Fitzgerald, Limerick	Ballylanicoe	Clanwilliam		50
---	22	James Kelly - - - ditto	Rockstown	ditto		50
---	23	William Wilson, Cahircostish	Cahircostish	ditto		50
---	24	William James Bean, Limerick	Coolbreedane	Owensybeg		50
---	25	George Bruce, county Cork	Garronecroosna	Cosken		50
---	26	George L. Bennett, Limerick	Castleena	ditto		50
---	27	James Goddell, Soho Lodge	Sueville	ditto		50
---	28	Samuel Hunt, Meidenhall	- - Garryleagh, Rensk, Upper and Lower Gleniam, Clacasta & Melmount Debart.	ditto		50
---	29	W. W. Penzfather, Nenagh	Melmount Debart	ditto		50
---	30	Joseph L. Penzfather, Newport	- ditto -	ditto		50
---	31	Robert Evans, Newtown Ehard	Ulla	Coonagh		50
---	32	Devis K. O'Dwyer, Cullen	Ballyneely	ditto		50
3d	none.					
3d	1	John A. Douglas, Limerick	Garryduff	Upper Connelloe		50
4th	none.					
5th	1	Richard Wall, ditto	Ballyneely	Coonagh		50
6th	none.					
7th	1	Right hon. Lord Adair, Adair	Tough	Kesey		50
---	2	John Lov, city Dublin	Auhid	Cashma		50
8th, 9th, & 10th	none.					
11th	1	Hon. Charles H. Sturford, 18th Regiment.	- - Awney, alias Knockaney, Bally-lackish, Gortelconagh, Kilgobbin and Cron-well.	Small County		50
12th, 13th, 14th, 15th, and 16th	none.					
17th	1	Michael Keyes, Glinbrohane	Mitchelstowndown	Cosken		50

25 February 1837.

M. H. D'Ossey,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF THE CITY OF LIMERICK.

Name, &c.	Residence.	Denomination, &c.	Value.	Name of the Person granting Rentscharge.
1. Thomas Boyce, esq.	George's-street, city Limerick.	Rentscharge on house at George's-street	£ 50	-- The affidavit of rentscharge does not state the name of the grantor of rentscharge.
2. Samuel Barrington, esq.	City Limerick	-- Rentscharge on houses at Lower Mallem-street, city Limerick.	50	
3. Edward William Burton, esq.	Williamstown, county Dublin.	-- Rentscharge on the lands of Bascloaks, Cloughcloaks, Ballynac, Tiernemontara and Moragna, Liberties Limerick.	20	
4. James F. Carroll, esq., u.p.	George's-street	-- Rentscharge on lands of Decreee, otherwise Shannon Park, Liberties Limerick.	50	
5. Daniel Gbbett, esq.	Bark-place, city Limerick.	-- Dwelling-house and store at Denmark-street, city Limerick.	50	
6. Robert Gbbett, esq.	Bark-place	-- Dwelling house and store at Denmark-street	50	
7. Francis William Hartney, merchant.	Clare-street	-- Rentscharge on lands at Castle quarter and Hill quarter of Rivers, Liberties Limerick.	50	
8. Philip Lyons, esq., u.p.	Thomas-street, city Limerick.	-- Rentscharge on stores at Upper William-street, city Limerick.	50	
9. Patrick M-Namara, esq.	George's-street	-- Rentscharge on house at George's-street, city Limerick.	20	
10. Henry O'Shea, gentleman.	Catherine-street	-- Rentscharge on plot of ground at Wickham-street, city Limerick.	20	
11. Richard Russell, esq.	George's-street, city Limerick.	-- Rentscharge on mills at Upper Henry-street, city Limerick.	50	
12. Arthur Russell, esq.	- ditto -	-- Rentscharge on premises at Francis-street, city Limerick.	50	
13. John Sheehy, solicitor	Roches-street	-- Rentscharge on lands of Peafold, Liberties Limerick.	20	
14. George Vincent, esq.	Erin, county Clare.	-- Rentscharge on lands at Ballysimon, Liberties Limerick.	50	

Edward Parker, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF LONDONDERRY.

No.	Name and Residence of Grantor.	Town.	Denomination.	Name of Grantee.	£ 50	£ 10
1	Thomas D. Botson, Londonderry	city Londonderry	house in city of Londonderry	Sir R. Botson	-	20
2	Henry Marshall, like	- like -	- like -	Wm. Marshall	-	20
3	William George Marshall, like	- like -	- like -	- like -	-	20
4	John Smyth, jun., Ardmore	- like -	- lot of ground whereon custom-house stores of Londonderry stand.	J. A. Smyth	-	20
5	William D. Smyth, like	- like -	- like -	- like -	-	20
6	Mitchell Smyth, Carragh	- like -	- like -	- like -	-	20
7	Hamil Smyth, Ardmore	- like -	- like -	- like -	-	20
8	Rev. T. Smyth, Londonderry	- like -	- like -	- like -	-	20
9	Robert Alexander, Portlennone	Loughishollen	lands of Cleggan, co. of Londonderry	none stated in affidavit	50	
10	George Smyth, Capt. 6th regiment	Tukeeran	lands of Liffelin, like	- like -	-	20
11	James Boyle, Dublin	Keenought	lands of Monreney, like	- like -	-	20
12	James Boyle, Magherafelt	Loughishollen	lands of Deranlaw, like	Henderson Boyle	-	20
13	Conolly Boyle, Dublin	- like -	lands of Cloughan, like	none stated in affidavit	-	20
14	Thomas Cather N. Linsavady	Keenought	house and premises in N. Linsavady	- like -	-	20
15	John Henry Bery	- like -	lands of Gortnaghy, co. Londonderry	Rev. Rd. Olphert	-	20
16	James S. Hunter, Ballaghy	- like -	- like -	H. B. Hunter	-	20
17	John Hunter, like	- like -	- like -	- like -	-	20
18	Robert A. Hunter, like	- like -	- like -	- like -	-	20
19	William Hunter, like	- like -	- like -	- like -	-	20
20	John King, Dungiven	- like -	houses in N. Linsavady	like	-	20
21	Benjamin Lane, Ballycarton	- like -	lands of Ballycarton	like	-	20
22	Thomas T. R. Miller, Montymore	Loughishollen	lands of Montymore	like	-	20
23	John R. Miller, like	- like -	- like -	like	-	20
24	Alex. R. Miller, like	- like -	- like -	like	-	20
25	Adam J. McRory, Ardmore Lodge	- like -	lands of Killyberry	like	-	20
26	John Shell, Castle Dawson	- like -	Black Park	like	-	20
27	William Steel, Londonderry	- like -	lands of Ballymacperke, like	like	-	20
28	Harvey Nichollson, like	city Londonderry	houses and premises, city Londonderry	John Nichollson	-	20

4 March 1837.

James Gregg, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF LONGFORD.

Name and Residence.	Barony and Description of Land on which the Rentscharge is granted.	Assessed Value.	Name of the Person granting the Rentscharge.
Rev. Peter Langley, South Cumberland-street, Dublin.	-- Barony of Rathcline, townland of Gravelhill.	£ 20	As the affidavits do not state by whom the rentscharges were granted, the clerk of the peace cannot furnish any information on the subject.
Andrew Wm. Bell, of Creevy, coq.	-- Barony of Ardragh, townland of Cullyvara.	50	
Thomas Gregory, jun., of Carrickmoira, esq.	-- Barony of Granard, townland of Aughaskilmore.	20	
Joseph H. Smyth, of Smythbrook, esq.	-- Barony of Abbyshrale, townland of Bethaney.	20	
Henry E. W. Sistor, of Clarence-street, Liverpool.	-- Barony of Granard, townland of Killycoary.	20	
Rev. Jas. Stephenson, of Arvagh, county Cavan.	-- same, townland of Drumholy	20	
Parrell Kieran, of Coldoney, Dublin.	-- same, townland of Friskill	20	
W. C. Hamilton, of Caffo-street, Dublin.	-- Barony of Rathcline, townland of Castlecar.	20	
Rev. Francis Gregg, of Oultawa.	-- Barony of Granard, townland of Carrickduff.	50	
Rev. George B. Moffatt, of Deurslane, county Cavan.	-- Barony of Abbyshrale, townland of Keale Paddock.	20	
Parrell Kieran, of Coldoney	-- Barony of Granard, townland of Friskill.	20	
Brynn Rock, of Corina, esq.	-- Barony of Longford, townland of Kappogus.	20	
John Briedy, of Corina	-- same, townland of Anna	20	

23 February 1837.

-John F. Croughal, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF LOUTH.

No.	Number Registered at each Section.	Name of Rentscharge.	Residence.	Date of Issue when Registered.	Description of Land on which Charge was granted.	Barony.	Assessed Registered.	Name of Person granting Rentscharge.	Observations.
1	1	Richard Simon Byrns.	-- Rosmalon, co. Louth.	-- special session under Reform Act, commencing 10th October 1832.	Dunnaghen	-- Upper Dundalk.	£ 20	-- Not mentioned in affidavit of registry.	This affidavit of rentscharges registered previous to the Reform Act, and re-registered thereunder, do not state the name of the grantor.
2	2	Walter Haro	-- Newlands, county Westford.	-- same	Deadalk	-- same	20	-- Anne Countess of Roden and Robert Earl of Roden.	
3	3	James Heady	-- Dunnaghen, co. Louth.	-- same	Dunnaghen	-- same	20	Not mentioned in affidavit of registry.	
4	4	James Tallon	Dundalk, co. Louth	-- same	Dungwoley	-- same	20		
5	5	Peter Magrath	-- same	-- same	Killicarry	Lower Dundalk	20	George Murphy.	
6	6	Geo. Murphy	-- same	-- same	Castletown	Upper Dundalk	20		
7	7	Frederick Shaw	-- Kimmage House, county Dublin.	-- same	Dundalk	-- same	20	-- Anne Countess of Roden and the Earl of Roden.	
8	8	Malc ^m M'Neale	-- Ballymascannon, county Louth.	-- same	Ballymascannon, Plaister, Aghnaskough, Ballymascallet, the Fogharts, Ballymascannon, Dromard, Carranna & Edin-tobber.	-- Lower Dundalk.	20	-- Not mentioned in affidavit of registry.	
9	9	Robt. M'Neale	-- same	-- same	Ballymascannon, Ballymascallet, Fogharts and Plaister.	-- same	20	J. Wolfe M'Neale.	

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[113

No.	Number Registered at each session.	Name of Rent-charger.	Residence.	Date of Session when Registered.	Description of Land on which Charge was granted.	Town.	Amount Registered.	Name of Person granting Rent-charge.	Observations.
10	10	James Verdon	Newry, co. Down	- - Special session under Reform Act, commencing 10 Oct. 1832.	Monkland	- - Lower Dundalk.	£ 20	- Not mentioned in affidavit.	
11	11	Rob. Atkinson	- - Chansorock, county Louth.	- same -	Chansorock	Louth	20	- ditto -	
12	12	Nicholas Marmion.	Louth, co. Louth	- same -	- - Louth and Mullacree.	- same -	20	- ditto -	
13	13	Norman Garstin	Begginstown, ditto	- same -	Begginstown	Ardee	20	- ditto -	
14	14	Chas. McClin- tock.	Drumore, ditto	- same -	Drumore	- same -	20	- ditto -	
15	15	Robt. McClin- tock.	- same -	- same -	- same -	- same -	20	- ditto -	
16	16	John Shegog	- - Drogheda, county of the town of Drogheda.	- same -	Lambown	- same -	20	- ditto -	
17	17	John Tisdall	- - Redmondstown, county Westmeath.	- same -	Charleville	- same -	20	- ditto -	
18	18	Edward Tisdall	- Rathcoole House, county Louth.	- same -	- same -	- same -	20	Charles Tisdall	
19	19	Thos. Wright	- - Great Charles-street, Dublin.	- same -	Tuteboys	- same -	20	- Not mentioned in affidavit of registry.	
20	20	- Jos. Wright, Junior.	- Killinacole, county Louth.	- same -	- Wisetavern-street & Main-street, Ardee.	Ardee	10	- ditto -	
21	21	Travers Wright	Dundalk, co. Louth	- same -	Tuteboys	- same -	20	- ditto -	
22	22	Stephen Wright	Killinacole, ditto	- same -	- Wisetavern-street & Main-street, Ardee.	- same -	20	- ditto -	
23	23	Owen Armstrong	Dublin	- same -	Tyran	Ferrard	20	- ditto -	
24	24	Patrick Curtis	Recluck, co. Dublin	- same -	Townshelton	- same -	20	- ditto -	
25	25	William Pous- roy Green.	Collon, co. Louth	- same -	Collon	- same -	20	- ditto -	
26	26	Wm. Penland.	Rutland-sq., Dublin	- same -	Blackhall	- same -	20	- ditto -	
27	27	T. J. Sheridan	Marley, co. Louth	- same -	Marley	- same -	20	- ditto -	
28	28	Wm. Nassau Sherard.	- Coorin, Queen's County.	- same -	- same -	- same -	20	- ditto -	
29	1	Michael Boylan	- - Blakestown, co. Louth.	3 Jan. 1833	Seasman	Ardee	20	- ditto -	
30	1	Nick. Magrino	- - Welshstown, co. Louth.	7 April 1834	Barn	Ferrard	20	Nicholas Markey	
31	1	Step. McGusty	- - North Cumber- land-street, Dublin.	1 Jan. 1835	Dundalk	- Upper Dun- dalk.	20	George McGusty	
32	1	James Clarke	- - Ravensdale, co. Louth.	2 April 1835	Mullyard	- - Lower Dundalk.	20	Sir H. Goodricke	
33	1	Henry Stanley McClin- tock.	Drumore, co. Louth	- same -	Canahstown	Ardee	20	John McClin- tock	
34	2	Will. Busbry McClin- tock.	- same -	- same -	- same -	- same -	20	John McClin- tock	
35	1	Henry Black- well.	Dunleer, co. Louth	23 June 1835	Dunleer	Ferrard	20	- - Henry Munro Blackwell.	
36	1	Thos. William Blackwell.	- same -	- On appeal from said sessions.	- Cortown, and moorain lands of Dunleer.	- same -	20	- - Henry Munro Blackwell.	
37	3	Frederick John Foscar.	- Upper Fitzwilliam- street, Dublin.	23 June 1825	- - Castling, Drumceath, Bal- lyoughan, Carrickles, Cor- tell, Carrickgallon, Cross- abegagh, Muchash, Ashbeg, Carrickmillen, Newtown, Palmerlands, Tullaglee, Deungonsally, Ardony, Mullaghtabee, Kierony, Upper and Lower Anaghs, Emsrigh, Hoarstown and Newrath.	Louth	50	Rebecca Foster	
38	1	Burton Broth- son.	- - Lower Gloucester- street, Dublin.	20 Oct. 1835	Senfield	Ferrard	20	- Henry Lambert Brothson.	
39	1	E. M'Alister	Dundalk, co. Louth	5 Jan 1836	Dundalk	Upper Dundalk	20	Jan. M'Alister	
40	1	A. Thompson	- Annaxera, county Louth.	6 April 1836	Dawdshill	- same -	20	- Charlotte M'Clintock.	

The affidavits of rent-chargers registered previous to the Reform Act, and re-registered thereunder, do not state the name of the grantor.

Thomas Bourer, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF MAYO.

Name of Freeholder.	Residence.	Name of Land.	Name of Bury.	By whom granted.	Value of Freehold.	Years in which Registered.					
						1833.	1834.	1835.	1836.	1837.	1838.
William Gardiner	Cloona	Knocknaspark	Tyrarwy	Name not taken	50	-	1				
Armsley Knox, jun.	Rappa Castle	Bubble Cpt	- ditto	Armsley Knox, jun.	50	1					
John Knox	- ditto	Genove and Eastfort	- ditto	- ditto	50	1					
Rev. St. Geo. Knox	- ditto	Rathnasmagh	- ditto	- ditto	50	1					
Henry Knox	- ditto	Ballynahorna	- ditto	- ditto	50	1					
Francis Knox	- ditto	Cloankee	- ditto	- ditto	50	1					
Jas. Armsley Knox	- ditto	- ditto	- ditto	- ditto	50	1					
James Brown	Claremont	- Clare & Mt. Brown	Claremont	- Rt. Hon. Denis Brown	50	1					
Alex. C. Lambert	Bellinchoe	Coolros & Leodane	- ditto	Joseph Lambert	50	1					
Edward Blake	Leakview	Kilmacdough	Kilmoin	Edward Blake	50	1					
J. Geoffrey Browne	Kiddington, Engle	Castle M'Garrett	Clannacris	Name not taken	50	1					
Thomas Lambert	Cragadoone	Crisalia	- ditto	Name not taken	50	1					
William Livingston	Westport	Westport	Murrisk	Name not taken	50	1					
Arthur S. Perkins	Ballybroony	Ballybroony	Tyrarwy	John Perkins	20	1					
John Perkins, jun.	- ditto	Bullinacorey	- ditto	- ditto	20	1					
William Perkins	- ditto	Ryglan	- ditto	- ditto	20		1				
W. Steph Jobrston	Brinkinst., Dublin	Raduff	Clannacris	Name not taken	20	1					
Anthony Stanfield	Clare	Bullinastanford	- ditto	F. W. Stanford	20	1					
Chas. Larmain	Westport	Westport	Murrisk	Name not taken	20	1					
Rosley Dawson	Tarmoncarn Glebe	Tarmoncarn	Ervis	Rev. Jas. Dawson	20			1			
John Brunick	Beechgrove	Noorgogagh	Kilmoin	W. Brunick	20	1					
William Larmain	Westport	Newport	Barrisbaole	Jos. C. Larmain	20	1					
Henry Dudgeon	Castlebar	Castlebar	Carro	John Dudgeon	20	1					
James O'Dowd	Criggaun	- ditto	- ditto	Roger O'Dowd	50	1					

Peace Office, Ballinrobe, 4 March 1837.

Thomas Galvin, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF MEATH.

Name.	Residence.	Decimation.	Bury.	Grantee.	Amount
John Kelly	City of Dublin	Arboreen	Lower Dooco	By will	50
George Beckett	Newtown	- ditto	- ditto	- ditto	50
James Plunkett	Cooltown	- ditto	- ditto	- ditto	50
James G. Murphy	Braymount	Derrypatrick	- ditto	- ditto	50
Hon. R. E. Plunkett	Donsay Castle	Glebe	- ditto	Lord Dunsany	50
James O'Reilly	Lispapple	Micknatstown	Upper Dulock	James R. M. Hussey	50
Gustava N. Hamilton	Dublin	Bellenstown	- ditto	Charles Hamilton	20
Charles Pepper	County of Dublin	Jedinstown	Lower Dulock	No grantor mentioned in affidavit	50
Rev. William Pepper	Ballygarth	- ditto	- ditto	- ditto	50
William M. Wade	Swadliffe	Bettystown	- ditto	Rev. T. Wade	50
Frederick Wade	City of Dublin	- ditto	- ditto	- ditto	50
Rev. Phillip Smyth	Moyvalley	Deane	- ditto	Phillip Smyth	50
John Cornwall	Dublin	Pairstown	- ditto	Gustava Lambert	50
George Battersby	City of Dublin	Kinnahon	Downfore	- ditto	50
Robert Battersby	Boboville	The Parks	- ditto	- ditto	50
Richard L. Battersby	- ditto	Cloneybeany & Dymar	- ditto	- ditto	50
Thomas J. Battersby	- ditto	Dymar	- ditto	- ditto	50
Edward G. Battersby	Jonsborough	- ditto	- ditto	No grantor mentioned in the affidavit.	50
John Battersby	Lakefield	Peikellstown	- ditto	- ditto	50
James Kearney	Milltown	Galmystown	- ditto	- ditto	50
Patrick Kearney	- ditto	- ditto	- ditto	- ditto	50
Joseph Lynch	Reebuck	Belroth	- ditto	- ditto	50
Robert C. Wade	Cloneybeany	Cloneybeany	- ditto	William B. Wade	50
Henry Purdon	Killooley	Woodtown	Upper Dooco	Edward Purdon	50
Charles W. Hamilton	City of Dublin	Hamerood	Duchoyne	Charles Hamilton	50
Thomas Mathews	Baytown Park	Baytown Park	- ditto	No grantor mentioned	50
Francis Battersby	Beherville	Balown	Upper Kells	Colonel W. Battersby	50
Charles Battersby	- ditto	Pysstown	- ditto	- ditto	50
Robert Woodward	Drumbarrow	Drumbarrow	- ditto	No grantor mentioned	50
William E. Woodward	- ditto	- ditto	- ditto	Henry Woodward	50
Toveana Walker	City of Dublin	Carand & Ballair	Lower Kells	No grantor	50
George A. Pollock	Mountinstown	Dooco	- ditto	A. H. C. Pollock	50
Rev. John Bourke	Martinstown	Moyrath	Lunc	No grantor mentioned	50

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[115

Name.	Residence.	Descendents.	Barony.	County.	Amount.
William Chapman	Kilrea Castle	Fryne	Lane	No greater men- tioned	£. 20
Benjamin Chapman	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
Robert Gussing	Clifton Lodge	Vesington	ditto	Lord Darby	20
Philip E. Purdon	Kilkenley	Clonsmore	ditto	Edward Purdon	20
Rev. Patrick O'Donohoe	Reeluck	Moyrah	ditto	Henry Grant	20
William Codd	Killeshilken	Killeshilken	Upper Meyfynagh	Mary of Lansdown	20
Robert Hen. Battersby	Lakefield	Sennenstown	Lower Meyfynagh	No greater mentioned	20
Lambert Disney	Rockledge	Admestown	ditto	Thomas Disney	20
James Disney	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
Rev. Edward Disney	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
Thomas Disney, jun.	City of Dublin	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
Henry P. Disney	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
Mathew Mathews	Braytown Park	Ballynakill	ditto	No greater men- tioned	20
John Thompson	Rothinilly	Mundine	ditto	ditto	20
John G. Pollock	Mounstinstown	Mounstinstown	Mounstinstown	A. H. C. Pollock	20
Edward Bligh	Brittas	Brittas	ditto	Thomas High	20
James Healy	Farganstown	Carracop	ditto	James Healy	20
Joseph Healy	Kilbeide	ditto	ditto	Robert Healy	20
Joseph Murphy	Ashby	Vesington	Upper Navan	Earl of Darby	20
Richard W. Reynall	Killynyn	Mesdara	ditto	No greater mentioned	20
James Noble	Allenstown	Allenstown	Lower Navan	Rev. George H. Walker	20
John Noble	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
Patrick Muldoon	Oldcastle	Newtown	Ratoath	T. Thompson	20
Charles J. Murphy	Dublin	Kelbica	ditto	William Murphy	20
James Murphy	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
William Murphy, jun.	ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
Joh. Kelleit	Barleyhill	Barleyhill	Lower Slane	Richard Kelleit	20

17 March 1837.

Robert Chambers, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF MONAGHAN.

No.	No. in Co. Book.	Name of Proprietor.	Residence.	Barony.	Descendents.	Name of Landlord or Person granting the Charge.	Yearly Value.	Place and Date of Registry.
1	45	Blackburn, Robert	Legacurry	Trough	Devenlisset	W. Anketell, esq.	£. 20	Monaghan - 10 Oct. 1834.
2	113	Burnside, W. Smith	Casemerry-barro	Dartry	Killygeen	M. Burnside, esq.	20	ditto - 11 ditto.
3	151	Blayney, Hon. C. Davies.	Castiblayney	Cremorne	Onarry, Ankerell, & Conyberry.		50	Castiblayney - ditto.
4	206	Johnston, H. G., esq.	Coekill	Trough	Tallycollog		20	Monaghan - 22 ditto.
5	545	Moutray, A., esq.	Favor Royal	same	Derramuck		20	ditto - 23 ditto.
6	547	Moutray, Rev. J. C., clerk.	same	same	Cavan Moutray		20	ditto - ditto.
7	548	Moutray, Whit., esq.	same	same	same		20	ditto - ditto.
8	549	Moutray, Rev. T.	same	same	Derrygery		20	ditto - ditto.
9	535	Mayne, F. G., esq.	Prossmount	Dartry	Prossmount		20	ditto - 24 ditto.
10	1004	Swanzy, John, gent.	Dublin	Cremorne	Dromshill & Corleodargin.	Mr. Swanzy	20	ditto - 1 Nov. 1834.
11	1164	Young, Forbes, esq.	same	Dartry	Lecklery	W. Young, esq.	20	ditto - 9 ditto.
12	1178	Wright, J. C., gent.	Caracher	Monaghan	Caracher	J. Wright, esq.	20	ditto - ditto.
13	1077	Cranford, J. A., jun.	Auburn	same	Begon	T. Begon, esq.	20	Castiblayney 25 Mar. 1835.
14	1498	Montgomery, A., esq.	Bosmount	same	Greganagh	A. N. Montgomery, esq.	20	ditto - 19 June 1834.
15	7201	Swanzy, James	Milimount	Cremorne	Dromshill & Corleodargin.	A. Swanzy, esq.	20	ditto - ditto.
16	1205	Swanzy, Rev. Henry	Youghal	same	same	Rev. H. Swanzy	20	ditto - ditto.
17	7205	Montgomery, Arthur.	Bosmount-park.	Trough	Lovart	A. N. Montgomery.	20	ditto - ditto.
18	1681	Montgomery, Rob.	same	same	same		20	Monaghan - 1 July 1835.
19	1692	Moutray, Henry, esq.	Favor Royal	same	Derrygery and Cassa.	John C. Moutray, esq.	20	ditto - 19 Oct. -
20	1693	Moutray, William	same	same	same		20	ditto - ditto.
21	1710	Kennedy, Robert	Corness	Monaghan	Roeskey	Lord Rosmore	20	ditto - ditto.
22	1717	M'Adoo, James	Termodown	same	Lisbrick and Stackerin.	Hon. R. Westmore	20	ditto - ditto.
23	3115	Crawford, Thomas	Fortingleton	same	Begon		20	ditto - 2 Jan. 1837.

Robt. Smith, Clerk of the Peace.

QUEEN'S COUNTY.

No. of Registrations Registered at each Session.	Date of Session.	Name and Residence of each Person Registered.	Barony and Description of Land on which Charge was granted.	Name of Person granting the loan.	£.	s.	d.
		-- D. Egan, of Mountsrath, Queen's County.	-- Maryborough West, houses and lands in Lower Mountsrath and Noorcbawn.	Thomas Dodd	£.	50	-
		-- William Gray, of Maryborough, Queen's County.	-- Maryborough West, Upper and Lower Irej.	-- H. P. Broadfield, administrator of G. Broadfield.	50	-	-
		-- Rev. Henry George Johnson, of Boagor, County Down.	-- Maryborough West, Springmount and Killeany.	- Dame Sackville J. Walsh, otherwise Eccroan.	-	20	-
		-- Ralph Henry Johnson, of Bally Kildreas, Queen's County.	-- Maryborough West, Springmount and Killeany.	- Dame Sackville J. Walsh, otherwise Eccroan.	-	10	-
		-- William Treacy, of Roycetown, County Kildare.	-- Maryborough West, houses and premises in Mountsrath.	- John Treacy	-	30	-
		-- Henry Walsh, of Mountsrath, Queen's County.	-- Maryborough West, lands of Desert-leagh.	By will	-	30	-
		J. Moyle, of Portarlington, Queen's Co.	Perinshinch, lands of Carren	James Mayles	-	15	-
		-- Rev. William Washburn, of Garrybinch, King's County.	Portshinch, lands of Tenehill	-	-	10	-
		-- John Cassidy, of Monasterevan, County Kildare.	Ballynams, lands of Ballylehan	-	-	50	-
		-- Benjamin Henry Johnson, of Margorrey, County Cork.	Ballynams, lands of Rathgilbert	-	-	20	-
		Pat. Finn, of Carlow, County Carlow	Shewmarigue, lands of James Mardews	William Finn	-	10	-
		-- John Lecky, jun., of Kilmalogue, King's County.	-- Shewmarigue, lands of Clonbrock and Mays.	-	-	50	-
		T. Baldwin, of Stradbally, Queen's Co.	Stradbally, lands of Ballymaideck	-	-	10	-
		-- Hercules Kelly, of Stradbally, Queen's County.	-- Stradbally, houses and concerns in Stradbally.	-	-	10	-
		-- William Grace Kelly, of Stradbally, Queen's County.	Stradbally, lands of Stradbally	-	-	10	-
		-- Weldon Tarleton, of Stradbally, Queen's County.	Stradbally, houses in Stradbally	-	-	10	-
		-- Christopher Bailey, of Cappalough, Queen's County.	-- Cullinagh, lands of Garryglass, Castletrough and Ballyvoan.	Robert Mills	50	-	-
		R. Berdy, of Mountsrath, Queen's Co.	Cullinagh, lands of Moyadd	Wm. S. Vicars	-	10	-
		-- Philip Poulet Doyne, of Oldpark, Queen's County.	Cullinagh, lands of Boobybeg	-	-	50	-
		R. Doyne, of Fethard, co. Wexford.	-- Cullinagh, lands of Clabharicus and Clontica.	-	-	50	-
		-- Charles William Doyne, of Tullow, County Carlow.	Cullinagh, lands of Ballyeagle	-	-	20	-
		-- Francis Trench, of Brockley-park, Queen's County.	-- Cullinagh, Upper Ossory and Maryborough West lands of manor of Lenix.	- John Lord Viscount De Vesci.	50	-	-
		-- Hon. Thomas Vesey, of Abbey-leix-hausse, Queen's County.	Cullinagh, lands of Monyclear	-	-	50	-
		J. Wolf, of Watercastle, Queen's Co.	Upper Ossory, lands of Killydooley	-	-	50	-
		-- Reverend George Cockburn, of Rutland-square, County of Dublin.	Upper Ossory, lands of Killydooley	-	-	10	-
		-- Phineas C. Cockburn, of Upper Fitzwilliam-street, Dublin.	Upper Ossory, lands of Garteen	-	-	10	-
		-- Bernard William Delaney, of Darrow, county Kilkenny.	Upper Ossory, lands of Rath and Cappalough	-	-	30	-
		John H. Drought	Upper Ossory, lands of Rumettdown	-	-	50	-
		-- Dawson Hutchingson, of Mount Henon, King's County.	Upper Ossory, lands of Coolins	-	-	50	-
		W. Hamilton, of Moyne, Queen's Co.	Upper Ossory, lands of Eglish	George Pratt	-	10	-
		R. Pratt, of Roscrea, Co. Tipperary	Upper Ossory, lands of Newtown	-	-	50	-
		-- James Shortt, jun., of Newtown, Queen's County.	Upper Ossory, lands of Sragh	-- Jas. Edmond Scott.	50	-	-
		-- James William Butler Scott, of Anngrove, Queen's County.	Upper Ossory, lands of Harriestown	-	-	10	-
		-- Anthony Sharp White, of Farrenville, Queen's County.	Maryborough West, lands of Ringstown	Sir C. H. Coote, bt.	-	50	-
1	2 Jan. 1833	R. Coste, of Portarlington, Queen's Co.	Upper Ossory, lands of Killooke	John Harte	-	50	-
		C. Harb, of Shinnone, King's Co.	Upper Ossory, lands of Harriestown	-- Michael Heed Drought.	-	50	-
3	3 April 1833	-- Richard Steele, of Farney Castle, county Tipperary.					

At first special registering sessions under Irish Statute Act, commencing on the 1st October 1830, and ended on the 1st November 1831.

No. of Resolutions passed in each Session.	Date of Session.	Name and Residence of each Person Registered.	Name and Description of Land on which Charge was granted.	Name of Person granting the same.	£. s. d.
		-- Rob. Clayton Brown, of Brown's-hill, county Cuhre.	Sliemargus, lands of Gouge	William Brown	£ 20
3	9 Apr. 1833	-- Charles Hartpole Bowen, of Stephen's-green, city of Dublin.	Niewerigus, lands of Mays	-- Charles Jones Bowen & Martha Bowen, otherwise Hartpole.	50
		-- Rev. Ralph Coste, of Brockville, King's County.	-- Maryborough West, lands of Ringtown.	-- Sir Charles H. Coote, bart.	20
1	20 June 1833	H. Bolton, of Killebeg, Queen's Co.	Upper Ossory, lands of Killebeg	George Bolton	10
1	24 June 1833	-- J. T. Burke O'Flahertie, of Regata Cottage, county Dublin.	-- Maryborough West, lands of Babina.	Jan. Edm. Scott	20
		W. Bolton, of Abbeyfeix, Queen's Co.	Upper Ossory, lands of Killebeg	George Bolton	10
		George Despard, of Trillick, co. Meath	Upper Ossory, lands of Donac	W. W. Despard	10
		-- Samuel Hutchison, of Mount Heaton, King's County.	Upper Ossory, lands of Russeldown	- - -	10
		-- Summers Hutchison, of Mount Heaton, King's County.	Upper Ossory, lands of Russeldown	- - -	20
		-- Joseph O'Meara, of Borris-in-Owen, Queen's County.	-- Upper Ossory, lands of Century-hill, Jamestown, Blisfield & Bohernac.	- - -	50
9	23 Oct. 1833	-- Samuel O'Meara, of Borris-in-Owen, Queen's County.	-- Upper Ossory, lands of Century-hill, Jamestown, Blisfield & Bohernac.	- - -	50
		J. Pierson, of Monasterevin, Queen's Co.	Upper Ossory, lands of Monasterevin	Henry Pierson	10
		-- William Standish, of Derrynaseery, Queen's County.	Upper Ossory, lands of Tinselilly	John Bolton	10
		-- William Wandroff, of Portrane, Queen's County.	-- Upper Ossory, lands of Graig-drinny, Berney and Bolady.	- - -	50
		-- Valentine Griffith, of Mountsrath, Queen's County.	-- Portashinch, lands of Laura and Dangan.	- - -	20
9	29 Oct. 1833	-- William Vicars Griffith, of Mountsrath, Queen's County.	-- Portashinch, lands of Laura and Dangan.	- - -	20
		G. Roe, of Larra, county Tipperary	Upper Ossory, lands of Gantaboo	William Roe	20
1	2 Jan. 1834	-- Sam. Campion, of French-street, Dublin.	-- Maryborough East, houses and lands in Maryborough and Money-ballyterill.	John Campion	20
		-- Francis Campion, of Blessington, county Wicklow.	-- Maryborough East, houses and lands in Maryborough and Money-ballyterill.	John Campion	20
		J. Basbridge, of Aharc, co. Wexford	Upper Ossory, lands of Derryduff	Thomas Roe	50
4	8 Apr. 1834	W. Wall, of New Court, Queen's Co.	Upper Ossory, lands of Killemasagh	William Delaney	10
		-- John Thacker, of Ballyswelish, Queen's County.	Upper Ossory, lands of Moom.	Barker Thacker	20
		H. Murphy, of Haggot-street, Dublin	Upper Ossory, lands of Cloranon	Reem. Casway	50
1	15 Oct. 1834	-- George Lawless, of Dysartbeg, Queen's County.	-- Maryborough West, lands of Dysartbeg.	James Lawless	20
1	6 Jan. 1835	-- Denby William Cooper Herring, of Sherle Castle, Queen's County.	Sliemargus, lands of Mountfield	-- Mary Ann H. Cooper.	10
		-- Edward Stephen Egan, Mountsrath, Queen's County.	-- Maryborough West, house and brewery in Mountsrath.	David Egan	10
		-- Henry B. Miller, of Badger-hill, Queen's County.	-- Maryborough West, lands of Mountsrath.	Arthur Miller	10
		H. Tinkler, of Kilmoleague, King's Co.	Stradbally, lands of Vicarstown	James Forcutt	20
		-- Sydney Cosby, of Stradbally-hall, Queen's County.	Stradbally, lands of Stradbally	T. Phillips Cosby	50
		D. Baldwin, of Rahenduff, Queen's Co.	Stradbally, lands of Vicarstown	J. Baldwin, jun.	10
		R. Baldwin, of Rahenduff, Queen's Co.	Stradbally, lands of Vicarstown	J. Baldwin	10
		-- Benjamin Boker Edge, of Clonbrack, Queen's County.	Sliemargus, lands of Clonbrack	John Edge	50
14	31 Mar. 1835	J. Dallas Edge, of city of Dublin	Sliemargus, lands of Clonbrack	John Edge	20
		-- Matthew Meredith, of Reaymore, Queen's County.	-- Tinselilly, lands of Carragheagh and Broccobeg.	Mat. Meredith	20
		-- Richard Hetherington, of Abbeyfeix, Queen's County.	Portashinch, lands of Jamestown	F. Hetherington	20
		C. F. Johnson, of city of Dublin	Portashinch, lands of Ballyshela	Christ. Johnson	10
		Stewart Lane, of city of Dublin	Portashinch, lands of Ballycullinbeg	Thomas Lane	10
		-- Stewart Treach, of Knockree, county Tipperary.	Portashinch, lands of Ballybrata	Maria Treach	10
		-- George Warburton, of Kilmoleague, King's County.	Portashinch, lands of Tiockill	Rich. Warburton	20
		-- William Biggs, of Borris Castle, Queen's County.	-- Upper Ossory, Bohernac, Century-hill, Jamestown and Borris	-- William and Fiddis Biggs.	50
		R. Brophy, of Darrow, co. Kilkenny	Upper Ossory, lands of Derreen	Thomas Palmer	20
		John Clegg, of city of Dublin	Upper Ossory, lands of Castlefening	-- Richard, John, Robert and Jas. Stanley.	20

No. of Bills changed or amended at each Session.	Date of Session.	Name and Residence of each Person Registered.	Extent and Description of Land on which Grants was granted.	Name of Person granting the same.	£. s. d.
14	7 April 1835	-- Jonathan Clogg, of Maryborough, Queen's County.	Upper Ossary, lands of Castleknock	Mary Clogg	£. s. d.
		-- Thos. Conway, of Athlone, county Westmeath.	Upper Ossary, lands of Clonza	Robert Owen	50
		-- Joseph F. Hutchison, of Mount Heaton, King's County.	Upper Ossary, lands of Russelstown	Ann Hutchison	50
		T. Harte, of Tinserry, co. Tipperary	Upper Ossary, lands of Coolowly	Charles Harte	50
		-- Robert Palmer, of Clontarf, Queen's County.	Upper Ossary, lands of Clonsilla	Edw. C. Palmer	50
		-- William Dawson Roberts, of Killybricken, Queen's County.	Upper Ossary, lands of Killybricken	-- Thomas and John Roberts.	50
		-- D. Treacy, of Mountcash, Queen's Co.	Upper Ossary, lands of Teneckelly	John Treacy	50
		-- Rev. Felix Treacy, of Ballylinan, Queen's County.	Upper Ossary, lands of Teneckelly	John Treacy	50
		-- William Galbraith, of Ballybritt, King's County.	-- Cullenagh, lands of Finner and Tunduff.	H. Galbraith	50
		-- Wellesley Pole Cosby, of Stradbally-hall, Queen's County.	Cullenagh, lands of Orchard	Thos. P. Cosby	50
2	25 June 1835	-- John Lyster, of Rathdowney, Queen's County.	-- Upper Ossary, houses, lands at Rathdowney.	Thomas Lyster	50
		G. Bolton, of Abbeylax, Queen's Co.	Upper Ossary, lands of Killebeg	-- Geo. Bolton, the elder.	50
3	30 June 1835	-- Hon. Wm. John Vesey, of Abbeylax, Queen's County.	Cullenagh, lands of Rathmoyle	-- John Lord Viscount De Vesel.	50
		W. Empey, of Stradbally, Queen's Co.	Ballyadams, lands of Ballynabber	Robert Empey	50
3	14 Oct. 1835	-- Rev. Jos. Chapman, of Bagnalstown, county Carlow.	Portneinch, lands of Ballybrittas	Maria Trench	50
		-- Henry Warburton, of Kilmalegue, King's County.	Portneinch, lands of Portneinch	Rich. Warburton	50
3	14 Oct. 1835	Richard Kemmis, of city of Dublin	Portneinch, lands of Kilmasham	Wm. Kemmis	50
		Thomas Kemmis, of city of Dublin	Portneinch, lands of Kilmasham	Wm. Kemmis	50
1	31 Oct. 1835	-- George Trench, of Mountjoy-square, county of Dublin.	-- Tineinch, lands of Coolvanna and Forrest.	By will	50
		P. Roe, jun. of Kildelg, Queen's Co.	Upper Ossary, lands of Torrsville	Peter Roe, senior	50
4	31 Dec. 1835	W. Barker, of Killoosly, co. Tipperary	Upper Ossary, lands of Bellinooat	T. H. Potensely	50
		Hen. Rich. Kemmis, city of Dublin	Upper Ossary, lands of Longford	Henry Kemmis	50
4	31 Dec. 1835	G. Verdefleur Steele, city of Dublin	Upper Ossary, lands of Skirk	Richard Steele	50
		-- J. Brett, of Rathmoyle, Queen's County.	Cullenagh, lands of Tunduff	-- John Lord Viscount De Vesel.	50
5	5 Jan. 1836	-- Edw. S. Casan, of Stradbally, Queen's County.	-- Maryborough East, lands of Ballysockan.	Rev. J. Casan	50
		-- James Milner, of Mountmelick, Queen's County.	Tineinch, houses in Mountmelick	John Milner	50
5	5 Jan. 1836	-- Wm. Kemmis, jun., of Ballinacry, county Wicklow.	Portneinch, lands of Kilmasham	Wm. Kemmis	50
		Simon Kenny, of Bella, Queen's Co.	Portneinch, lands of Bella	Thomas Kenny	50
4	13 Apr. 1836	-- Robert Walfendon Kenny, of Bella, Queen's County.	Portneinch, lands of Bella	Thomas Kenny	50
		G. Lodge, of Rathbarra, Queen's Co.	Upper Ossary, lands of Rathbarra	Rev. F. Lodge	50
4	13 Apr. 1836	-- Wm. Dawson Roberts, of Killybricken, Queen's County.	Upper Ossary, lands of Killybricken	Thomas Roberts	50
		-- George Roberts, of Knockanna, Queen's County.	-- Upper Ossary and Maryborough West, lands of Knockanna and Killybricken.	-- George and Thomas Roberts.	50
1	17 June 1836	-- J. Nugent, of Portaferry, county Down.	Cullenagh, lands of Rathmoyle	-- John Lord Viscount De Vesel.	50
		-- Phillip Laurence Lyster, of Millpark, county Tipperary.	-- Upper Ossary, lands of Rathdowney and Knockree.		50
3	23 June 1836	Hen. G. Fletcher, of city of Dublin	-- Maryborough East, lands and premises in Maryborough.	Mary Fletcher	50
		-- Mather S. Casan, of Sheffield, Queen's County.	Maryborough East, lands of Capoly	Mather Casan	50
4	19 Oct. 1836	-- Thomas Dillon, of Parsonstown, King's County.	-- Maryborough West, lands of Brookanna and Clonagoolan.		50
		-- Charles Henry Coote, of Ballyfin, Queen's County.	-- Maryborough West, lands of Redenac and Ballyfin.	-- Sir Charles H. Coote, bart.	50
1	27 Oct. 1836	-- Steph. Egan, of Roscrea, county Tipperary.	-- Maryborough West, houses and premises in Mountcash.	David Egan	50
		J. Lane, of Mountmelick, Queen's Co.	Portneinch, lands of Ballycolnabeg	Thomas Lane	50
1	4 Jan. 1837	-- William Francis Finn, of Kingstown, county Dublin.	-- Sliwemarie, lands of Graigac and Juncus Meadows.	William Finn	50
		John Kelly, of city of Dublin	Upper Ossary, lands of Killyermough	Matthew Deisy	50
1	4 Jan. 1837	Michael Cahill, of city of Dublin	Upper Ossary, lands of Archerstown	Michael Deisy	50

Wm. Caldwell, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF ROSCOMMON.

Name and Residence.	Barony.	Demarcation.	Name of Grantor.	£.s. or £.ss. Res- charge.
William Lloyd, Rockville	Roscommon	Rockville	Owen Lloyd, esq.	£. 50
William Malloy, jun., Oakport	Boyle	Foetra	W. Malloy, sen., esq.	20
Coots Malloy - ditto	ditto	Cloonaighbene	- ditto -	20
Christopher K. Taffie, Foxboro	Roscommon	Foxboro	Patrick Taffie, esq.	20
Patrick J. Taffie - ditto	ditto	Toberony	- ditto -	20
Rev. James Crofton, Sligo	ditto	Doonard & Mober	Jan. Crofton, sen., esq.	20
Danrick Carr, Frenchpark	Boyle	Sheepwalk	Arthur French, esq.	20
Charles French, Caber	ditto	Caber	- ditto -	20
Fitz. French, Beral Lodge	ditto	Curryruepeac	- ditto -	20
Maria Harlan, Ross	Roscommon	Rosmore East & Ransbeg paddock	George Harlan, esq.	20
John Harlan, ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
Patrick Harlan, ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
Michael Balfie, jun., Southpark	Ballinoblin	Southpark	Mich. Balfie, sen., esq.	50
Lizand West, Grauge, county Sligo	Roscommon	Straitstown	Rev. Charles West	20
James West - ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
Arthur J. French, Tosmoren	ditto	Kilmaurane	Jeffry M. French, esq.	50
Arthur O'Connor, Mountdrinan	ditto	Misseylea	Malow O'Connor, esq.	20
James T. Camyn, Ballinerry	Boyle	Linnaguogue	Nich. Camyn, esq.	20
James Murphy, Merion, county Dublin	ditto	Roberty & Cartron	Wm. Murphy, esq.	20
Charles James Murphy, ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
William Murphy, jun. - ditto	ditto	ditto	ditto	20
Edward Blakey, Dublin	Ballinoblin	Hallywell	John W. Carroll, esq.	20
John Balfie, jun., Lisdurn	Roscommon	Lisdurn	John Balfie, sen., esq.	20

13 February 1837.

John Marra, Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF SLAGO.

Year.	Number Registered.
1830	17
1833	none
1834	3
1835	none
1836	1
May 1837	1

Name of Estate Registered.	Leads on which Charged.	Persons by whom granted.	Amount Registered.	
			£.	£.
Philip Beatty	Drinahah, barony of Carbery	James Beatty	-	20
William Gillmor	Ballyglass - ditto	Not stated in the affidavit	-	20
And. T. Gillmor	Ballyglass - ditto	Not stated in the affidavit	-	20
John C. Martin	Edenville - ditto	Not stated in the affidavit	-	20
James Madden	Ratcliffe-street, Sligo, ditto	Not stated in the affidavit	-	20
Gragey C. Martin	Knox's-street, Sligo, ditto	Not stated in the affidavit	-	20
Leuzence Vernon	Wine-street, Sligo - ditto	Not stated in the affidavit	-	20
Andrew Baker	Knockmannagh, barony of Corran	John Trustable	50	-
James Irwin	Drumagranchy & Clois, ditto	Not stated in the affidavit	-	20
Owen Redfoss	Sligheen - ditto	Malachi Redfoss	-	20
David Beatty	Carrowmurry, barony of Liney	James Beatty and Jane Beatty	-	20
John A. Irwin	Muckla - ditto	James Irwin	-	20
James A. O'Hara	Tringrove - ditto	Not stated in the affidavit	-	20
George Fenton	Old Grauge, barony of Tírnebh	Not stated in the affidavit	-	20
George Fenton	Dromore - ditto	John Fenton	-	20
William Kelly	Deonfyan - ditto	Not stated in the affidavit	-	20
William Norcot	- Carroward, Cloonaugh, Carrowblain and Spring Garden, barony of Tírnebh	Sir James Crofton	50	-
John Smith	High Park, barony of Tírnebh	Jeremiah Jones	-	20
Maria Trempay	Carrowdarnan - ditto	Not stated in the affidavit	-	20
James Crofton, clerk	Loragh and Carroward, ditto	Sir James Crofton	50	-
Nichol Duke	Cashill, barony of Tírnebh	William Duke	-	20
Roger D. Robinson	Glanavagh, barony of Liney	Roger Robinson	-	20

R. B. Wynns, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF TIPPERARY.

No.	Name and Residence of Rentcharges Registered.	Barony and Description of Land on which the Charge was granted.	Name of the Person granting the same.	£. ss. or £. 10.	Session when Registered, and when.
1	Kellatt, John Dalton, Clonmel, county of Tipperary.	- - Middlethird, lands of Clonmel and Newtown.	Edward Kellatt -	£. 50	Clonmel - 10 Oct. 1839
2	Borton, Samuel William, Rochestown, county of Tipperary.	- - Middlethird, lands of Kilkennybeg.	- - - - -	50	ditto - ditto.
3	White, Wm., Clonmel, county of Tipperary.	- - 1/16 and 1/32, East, lands of Abbey.	John Garrett -	20	ditto - ditto.
4	Riell, Sam. Annerville, county of Tipperary.	- - 1/16 and 1/32, West, lands of Nicholasstown.	William Riell -	20	ditto - ditto.
5	Power, John, Cappoquin, co. Waterford.	- 1/16 and 1/32, West, lands of Kilsnoan and Coolinstallyh.	- - Right hon. Stephen Earl of Mount Cashel.	20	ditto - ditto.
6	Boyle, Richard Uniacke, Dohoboro, county Tipperary.	- - Upper Ormond, lands of Ballinacough.	- - - - -	50	Nenagh - ditto
7	Burke, Joseph, Elmhall, county Tipperary.	- - Lower Ormond, lands of Elmhall.	- - - - -	20	ditto - ditto
8	Waller, Sir Edmund, Priories, county Tipperary.	- - Oweasy and Arra, lands of Newport.	Lady Waller -	20	ditto - ditto
9	O'Sullivan, Jeremiah, 12, Clare-st., co. of Limerick.	- - Oweasy and Arra, lands of John.	James O'Sullivan -	20	ditto - ditto
10	Smith, Wm., 21, Kildare-st., in the county of city of Dublin.	- - Upper and Lower Ormond, houses and lands, Nenagh.	- - - - -	50	ditto - ditto.
11	Sedair, William, Shronehill, county Tipperary.	- - Clonwilliam, lands, Shronehill.	- - - - -	20	Tipperary ditto.
12	Bradshaw, Sam, Gombestown, county Tipperary.	- - Clonwilliam, lands, Ballyrobin.	- - - - -	20	ditto - ditto.
13	Bruce, George, Milltown, co. Cork.	- - Clonwilliam, lands, Gortashillen.	- - - - -	50	ditto - ditto.
14	Cornack, Cornelius, Bohernamaona, county Tipperary.	- - Kilsmanagh, lands, Bohernamaona.	Francis Burke -	50	Thurles - ditto.
15	Ryan, Philip Turner, Carrick-on-Suir, county Tipperary.	- - 1/16 and 1/32, East, houses, Clonmel.	Cornelius Ryan -	50	Carrick-on-Suir, ditto.
16	O'Callaghan, hon. Geo., Shanbally Castle, co. Tipperary.	- - 1/16 and 1/32, West, lands, Shanbally.	- - Cornelius Lord Viscount Lismore.	50	Clonmel - 2 Apr. 1835
17	Dunphy, John, Clonmel, co. Tipperary.	- - 1/16 and 1/32, East, houses, Clonmel.	- - Charles Jackson and Richard Carroll.	50	ditto - 18 Oct. 1835
18	O'Dwyer, John Keatings, Calen, county Tipperary.	Clonwilliam, lands, Calen -	Morgan O'Dwyer -	20	Cashel - 6 Jan. 1835
19	Buder, Richard, Ballyslatane, county Tipperary.	- ditto - ditto, Ballycarion.	- - - - -	50	ditto - ditto.
20	Benetti, Michael, Graffen-st., city of Dublin.	- - Boveria ditto, Stronastown.	Thomas Palmer -	50	Nenagh - 20 Dec. 1834
21	Ross, Rev. Wm., 6, Grattan-street, city of Dublin.	- - Oweasy and Arra, lands, Clonboy Lodge & Poltough.	John Benn -	50	Thurles - 30 Mar. 1835
22	O'Callaghan, hon. Cornelius, Shanbally Castle, county Tipperary.	- - 1/16 and 1/32, West, lands, Shanbally.	- - Cornelius Lord Viscount Lismore.	50	Clonmel - 7 Apr. 1835
23	Smith, Wm., 15, Merrion-sq. (south) county of the city of Dublin.	- - Lower Ormond, houses and lands, Nenagh.	Aquila Smith -	50	Nenagh - 21 June 1835
24	Smith, Aquila, 150, Lower Baggot-street, county of the city of Dublin.	- - Lower Ormond, houses and lands, Nenagh.	- same -	50	ditto - ditto.
25	Poe, James Jocelyn, Solihoro, county Tipperary.	- - Lower Ormond, lands, Knight.	James Poe -	20	ditto - ditto.
26	Hackett, Thos., Fusonstown, King's County.	- - Upper Ormond, lands, Ballintotty.	Samson Hackett -	50	ditto - ditto.
27	Kinahan, Daniel, Roebuck, co. Dublin.	- - Lower Ormond, lands, Ballyduff.	Dan. Kinahan, sen. -	50	ditto - ditto.
28	Leaver, James, Caroline-place, Queen-st., Chelsea, county of Middlesex, England.	- - Kilsmanagh, lands, Cloontpoole, &c. &c.	- - Thos. Henry Coppingier.	50	Thurles - 20 Mar. 1835
29	Moore, Edw. Crabbe, Moorestown, county Tipperary.	- - Clonwilliam, lands, Clonmoyney and Kilroos.	- - Maurice Crabbe Moore.	50	Clonmel - 11 Apr. 1835
30	Benetti, Wm., Riverston, co. Tipperary.	- - Lower Ormond, lands, Pustelilough.	John Benetti -	20	Nenagh - 1 July 1835
31	Phillips, Richard, jun., Mount Rivers, county Tipperary.	- - Oweasy and Arra, lands, Doonaco.	Richard Phillips, sen. -	50	Thurles - 18 Oct. 1835

I certify that the above Return is true and correct in every particular, to the best of my belief.

In the above list, where the grantor's name is not mentioned, the rentcharges were re-registered on the old form, in which the name of the grantor was not necessary to be stated, (vide form in the 10th Geo. 4, c. 9, schedule 5) except in No. 19, where the name of the grantor is omitted in affidavit.

Peace Office, February 1837.

T. Sadleir, Clerk of the Peace

COUNTY OF TYRONE.

Tenant.	Year.	Name and Residence of Person Registered	Tithing.	Description of Land on which Granted.	Name of Person granting.	Value.	
						£. s. d.	£. s. d.
East	1831	Wm. S. Burnside, Corcreevy	Clogher	Corcreevy	- - Anna Maria Burnside	-	1
Trillick	-	Alex. R. Miller, Moneymore	Dungannon	Gortaleury	Rewley Miller	-	1
-	-	T. T. R. Miller, ditto	- ditto	- ditto	- ditto	-	1
Elrath	1834	James M. Stronge, Tynan Abbey	Omagh	- Berrinackall, Upper.	- Sir James Matthew Stronge, bart.	-	1
-	-	H. M. Richardson, Rosford	- ditto	- Drumkinney	J. Richardson, esq.	-	1
Trillick	-	Edward Goudding, Lisapark	Dungannon	Kilgawney	G. R. Goudding, esq.	-	1
-	-	John M'Arce, Mullymossagh	- ditto	- Mullymossagh	Bernard M'Arce	-	1
-	-	Nathaniel Taylor, Caledon	- ditto	- Caledon	Elna Taylor	-	1
-	-	John Wilson, ditto	- ditto	- ditto	Thomas Wilson	-	1
Michelinna	-	George Hall Stack, Omagh	Sensbane	Mullighassoe	R. T. Stack	-	1
Elrath	1835	John M'Cauleland, ditto	- ditto	- Fieary	- Alex. M'Cauleland, esq.	-	1
East	-	Alexander Lighton, Roskey	- ditto	- Roskey	John Keyes	-	1
-	-	Wm. John Alexander, Caledon	Dungannon	Caledon	- Name not mentioned in affidavit.	-	1
-	-	John R. Banbury, Aagher	Clogher	Mullin	- Sir James R. Banbury, bart.	-	1
-	-	Peter M'Arce, Mulymoss	Dungannon	- Mulymoss & Ginnon	- Name not mentioned in affidavit.	-	1
Trillick	-	Robert Johnston, Lisnecollin	Omagh	Mullawney	Hugh Johnston	-	1
-	-	William Johnston, ditto	- ditto	- Anaghmore	Hugh Johnston	-	1
-	-	John Calvert Stronge, Dungannon	- ditto	- Upper Berrinackall.	- Sir James M. Stronge, bart.	-	1
Michelinna	-	Henry Moutray, Favour Royal	Clogher	Feddin	- John Curry Moutray, esq.	-	1
-	-	William Moutray, ditto	- ditto	- ditto	- ditto	-	1
Elrath	-	Huggins Marshal, Lakelield	Dungannon	Glenken	Joseph Marshal	-	1
-	-	Courtney Neaton, Dungannon	Clogher	Ballymagowan	Andrew Newtown	-	1
Elrath	1836	John Norris, Lisnally	Omagh	Edergold	Wm. Norris	-	1
Michelinna	-	Berisford Burton M'Mahon, Fortfield, county Dublin.	Sensbane	Mountfield	Sir W. M'Mahon	1	-
Elrath	1837	James Galbraith, Beragh	Omagh	Beragh & Laragh	George Galbraith	-	1
						Total	1 24

Omagh, 3 March 1837.

David Ansell, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF WATERFORD.

Date of Registry.	Name and Residence of Person Registered.	Tithing and Description of Land on which Charge was granted.	Name of Person granting the same.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
Special Statute 1830 by the British Act, commencing 10 October 1830	W. W. Barron, Dublin	- - Barony of Decies-within-Drum, lands of Goodene.	Henry Winston Barron	-	1
-	John Conn, Passage	Gaultier, - - - - - Fathleg	Benjamin Conn	-	1
-	Robt. T. Carew, Ballinamona	Middlethird, - - - - - Muzsibogus	Thomas Carew	-	1
-	George Ivis, Mount Alto	Gaultier, - - - - - Kaeckawellish	Henry Ivis	-	1
-	William Denis, Waterford	Middlethird, - - - - - Gurtacade	Henry Denis	-	1
-	Denis Coker Flynn, Waterford	Gaultier, - - - - - Kilcop	Barbon Flynn	-	1
-	Rev. Ben. Morris, Kilkenny	Gaultier, - - - - - Rasduff	Wm. Morris Bende	-	1
-	J. Allen Merritt, Prospect	Upperthird, - - - - - Kilkinn	Not stated in affidavit	-	1
-	James Maher, Tynmore	Middlethird, - - - - - Tynmore	Anne Maher	-	1
-	Rev. Edward Barron, Waterford	Decies-within-Drum, - - - - - Goulane	Henry Winston Barron	-	1
-	Benjamin Morris, Waterford	Upperthird, - - - - - Clonon	George Morris Wall	-	1
-	Thomas Morris, Waterford	Upperthird, - - - - - Murrinane	George Morris Wall	-	1
-	Samuel Roberts, Dublin	Decies-without-Drum, - - - - - Abbeystile	William Hughes	-	1
-	John Barron, Georgetown	Upperthird, - - - - - Georgetown	James Barron	-	1
-	Moses Barton, Kilmacthomas	Upperthird, - - - - - Kilmacthomas	Christopher Moses	-	1
-	Phineas Hunt, Carrigenaha	Decies-without-Drum, - - - - - Bristey	Not stated in affidavit	-	1
-	Thomas Hunt, Hermitage	Decies-without-Drum, - - - - - Bristey	Not stated in affidavit	-	1
-	Mich. Looorgan, Ballyvolshane	Decies-without-Drum, Williamstown	William Barron, jun.	-	1
-	William Power, Berrinackall	Decies-without-Drum, - - - - - Ballyvolshane	Not stated in affidavit	-	1

Date of Registry.	Name and Residence of Person Registered.	Distric and Denomination of Land on which Charge was granted.	Name of Person granting the same.	£. 50. Rents-charged.	£. 25. Rents-charged.	Total Rents.
17 Oct. - 1835	Abraham Anthony, Dungarvan	Glanshiery, lands of Carroghisheen	Not stated in affidavit	-	-	-
-	Henry Bagge, Dungarvan	Decies-within-Drum, - Grange	John Bagge	-	-	-
-	Rev. James Bagge, Ardmore	Decies-within-Drum, - Grange	John Bagge	-	-	-
-	William Greene, Kilmahanan	Glanshiery, - Kilmohan	Nutall Crane	-	-	-
-	Arthur Ashby, Ringville	Decies-within-Drum, - Shanahill	Not stated in affidavit	-	-	-
18 -	James Dower, Dungarvan	Decies-without-Drum, Dungarvan	Patrick Dower	-	-	-
-	Robert Dower, Shanahill	Decies-within-Drum, - Tynescart	Edmond Dower	-	-	-
-	Rich. Kennedy, Ballinamultina	Decies-within-Drum, - Kereen	Francis Kennedy	-	-	-
-	Sir Wm. J. Heron, Dromana	Decies-within-Drum, - Ballygowan	Henry Villiers Stuart	-	-	-
-	Thos. Edw. Kieley, Springmount	Decies-without-Drum, - Ballytan	Thomas Kieley	-	-	-
19 -	John Hean, Dungarvan	Upperthird, - Ballythomas	Beverly Hean	-	-	-
-	James Huston, Dungarvan	Decies-without-Drum, Kilkedangan	Pierce Huron	-	-	-
22 -	Han. Brown Poer, Belleville Park	Decies-without-Drum, - Mogely	Samuel Poer	-	-	-
-	Wayn. Palfier, Kandelstown	Decies-without-Drum, - Ballyboy	John Palfier	-	-	-
23 -	Donalck Ronayne, Youghall	Decies-within-Drum, - Ballyheeny	Not stated in affidavit	-	-	-
-	John Hean Waters, Dungarvan	Decies-without-Drum, Ballinmuck	Not stated in affidavit	-	-	-
-	Chas. Henry Welsh, Rockfield	Decies-within-Drum, Hacketstown	Not stated in affidavit	-	-	-
-	Edmond H. Webb, Youghall	Decies-within-Drum, - Grange	Henry Pierce Welsh	-	-	-
-	James Wm. Wall, Coolnamuck	Upperthird, - Coolnamuck	Charles William Wall	-	-	-
-	G. Beresford Poer, Belleville Park	Decies-without-Drum, - Mogely	Samuel Poer	-	-	-
1 Nov.	Beverly W. Kieley, Kinnelohan	Decies-without-Drum, Kinnelohan	Not stated in affidavit	-	-	-
2 -	Patrick Ronayne, Youghall	Decies-within-Drum, - Ballyheeny	Not stated in affidavit	-	-	-
-	Thomas Fuge, Rock Lodge	Decies-within-Drum, Ballyflerone	William Fuge	-	-	-
5 -	Rich. Pope, Jan, Sion Hill	Upperthird, - Lyncenearlagh	Richard Pope, sen.	-	-	-
-	Joshua Pope, Sion Hill	Upperthird, - Lyncenearlagh	Richard Pope, sen.	-	-	-
-	Alex. Richard Pope, Waterford	Upperthird, - Lyncenearlagh	Richard Pope, sen.	-	-	-
-	Charles S. Tandy, Sion Lodge	Middlethird, - Gauracrobolly	Not stated in affidavit	-	-	-
6 -	John Waters Maher, Tramore	Middlethird, - Tramore	Anne Maher	-	-	-
8 -	John Kieley, Dungarvan	Decies-without-Drum, - Killeagh	Thomas Kieley	-	-	-
9 -	Jas. Fremdergat, Carrick-on-Suir	Decies-without-Drum, Knockingetta	Charles Fremdergat	-	-	-
General Sessions of the Peace:						
7 Jan. - 1833	Dillon McNamee, Dublin	Decies-within-Drum, Ballinamultina	Alexander Mansfield	-	-	-
23 June - 1834	George Baste, Abbeyville	Decies-without-Drum, Ballymoola	George Baste, sen.	-	-	-
-	James Galwey, Dungarvan	Decies-without-Drum, Dungarvan	John Matthew Galwey	-	-	-
-	Berry Edw. Lawless, Dublin	Decies-within-Drum, Ballinamultina	Alexander Mansfield	-	-	-
4 Jan. - 1835	John Keily, jun., Stranacally	Coshmore and Coshbride, Stranacally	John Keily, sen.	-	-	-
19 Oct. -	John Hackett, Prospect	Middlethird, - Cullinagh	Thomas Garble	-	-	-
29 Dec. -	John Quin Wall, Waterford	Middlethird, - Tammore	Henry Sargent	-	-	-
11 March 1837.			Ret Delandre, Clerk of the Peace.			

CITY OF WATERFORD.

Registering Sessions.	Name and Residence of the Person Registered.	Distric and Denomination of Land, &c. on which Charge was granted.	Name of the Person granting same.	£. 50. Rents-charged.	£. 25. Rents-charged.	Total Rents.
October 1835	- Please George Barron, esq., Tramore, co. Waterford.	-- Ground, houses and premises at Coadun-lane, in the parish of Trinity Without, in the city of Waterford.	-- Cornelius Henry Bolton, esq., of the city of Waterford.	-	£. 20	-
-	- Joseph Mullovey Wilson, attorney, messge of St. John's, city of Waterford.	-- Lands and premises at Salsriew, in the parish of St. John Without, and co. of the city of Waterford.	-- Richard Wilson, late of Salsriew, in the county of the city of Waterford, esq., deceased.	£. 50	-	-
January 1835	- none.					-
March -	- none.					-
June -	- none.					-
October -	- none.					-
January 1834	- none.					-
April -	- none.					-
June -	- none.					-
October -	- none.					-
January 1835	- none.					-
April -	- none.					-
June -	- none.					-
October -	- none.					-
January 1836	- none.					-
April -	- none.					-
June -	- none.					-
October -	- none.					-
December -	- none.					-
						Total -

R. Coole, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF WESTMEATH.

No.	Name and Residence.	Determination of Land.	Townp.	Name of Person granting same.	Amount of Rent-charge.	Date of Registry.
1	Robert Bottenby, Bobbsvill	Shakernagh	Demifore	not stated	£.	
2	R. Fitzherbert Gatty, Ballyspaly	- Ballyhealy, Ballyvaue, Bolanstown, Ballin- loghradingson, Bal- lyhara, part of Balli- rath and Clooney.	Delvin	not stated	100	10 Oct. 1834.
3	Robert Daniel, Newfarrest	Higginstown	Moynahel	not stated	50	15
4	John Morley Dennis, Union-hill	- Lynn, called the Glebe of Moylishar.	Fertullagh	not stated	20	—
5	Geo. Morley Dennis, Union-hill	Lynn	ditto	not stated	20	—
6	Nicholas Evans, Lougtpark	Kill, Skichyue, Mon- doff and Garty als Gerty.	Moynahel	- F. Evans, the elder.	20	—
7	T. Orme FetherstonH., Carrick	Carrick	Fertullagh	not stated	20	—
8	Wm. FotherstonH., jun., Carrick	ditto	ditto	not stated	20	—
9	John FetherstonH., Carrick	ditto	ditto	not stated	20	—
10	T. Nugent Fitzgerald, Dooone	Scardespatrik	Farbill	not stated	20	—
11	Cahbert Fetherston, Moostown	- Lucanstown and Bally- swen.	ditto	not stated	20	—
12	J. Gray, Scrub-Isodge, Co. Mayo	Kilina	Delvin	not stated	20	16
13	S. Wentley Hoody, Beacon Castle	Beacon Castle	Moynahel	not stated	20	17
14	E. T. Kelly, Dromore-Isodge	Dromore	ditto	not stated	20	—
15	Anthony Rich. Kearney, Mole- worth-street, City of Dublin	Batstown	Delvin	not stated	20	—
16	Patrick John Kearney, Milltown, co. Meath.	Windtown	Demifore	not stated	20	18
17	J. Kearney, Milltown, co. Meath	Batstown	Delvin	not stated	20	—
18	Bryan Maxwell, Cloonclon	Kilina	ditto	not stated	20	19
19	John Hyacinth Nangle, Garrisker, co. Kildare.	Mayac	Demifore	not stated	20	—
20	O. Nugent, Bolingrove, co. Caron	Castletown	ditto	not stated	20	—
21	Henry Mallock Pilkington, Toar	Rathgarret	Fertullagh	not stated	20	20
22	Richard Winter Reynall, Killinan	Edmonton	- Moynahel & Magheraderson.	not stated	20	—
23	James Daniel Scully, Gillerstown	Gillerstown & Ballinoy	Demifore	not stated	20	22
24	James Talbot, jun., Eccles-street, Dublin.	- Balkinstown, Carrak- ree & Stromstown.	Kilkenry, West	not stated	500	—
25	Richard Tighe, Merrion-square, city of Dublin.	Southhill	Delvin	not stated	20	—
26	William Caulfield, Besown	- Piercestown and Wil- liamstown.	Rathcoorah	J. Caulfield	20	27
27	James Briscoe, Ross, King's Co.	Williamstown	Delvin	not stated	20	3 Nov. 1832.
28	Alexander Irwin, Cumminstown	Shinglass	Rathcoorah	not stated	20	12
29	Thomas Bottenby, Newcastle, co. Meath.	Glanidan	Demifore	- T. Botten- by, the elder.	20	14
30	Edmond Gibson, Martinstown	Martinstown	Corkree	Richard Kerr	20	—
31	Hugh Morgan Tuic, Sonna	- Sonna & Ballynflagh, Empor & Killohen.	Moygish	Hugh Tuic	20	15
32	Patrick Ryan, Cullinsmire	Fulsoy	Moynahel	Patrick Ryan	20	1 Dec.
33	W. Nangle, Garrisker, co. Kildare	Tierbrannagh	Corkree	Ch. Nangle	20	16
34	Geo. Jas. Hornidge, Calverstown	Calverstown	Fertullagh	J. Hornidge	20	17
35	William Rochfort, Kingstown	- Adamstown, Baltra- ay, Marlingstown, Clongowry, Balla- derry, Boardtown, Raconell & Clow- stown.	- Moynahel & Magheraderson.	- Under the will of the late G. Rochfort.	50	—
36	Patrick Murray Delamere, Killan	Killenslaughe	Corkree	F. Delamere	20	3 Jan. 1833.
37	C. Mathews, Kildare-house	Mount Temple	Clonclon	R. Mathews	20	28 Mar. 1835.
38	John Ganigan, Templestown	Templestown	Demifore	T. Nugent	20	27 June 1834.
39	Patrick Pamer, Barcostown	Castletown	Moynahel	- Under the will of the late R. Malene.	20	5 Jan. 1836.
40	Gustavus Lambert, the younger, Bowlark,	Kilbeggan	ditto	G. Lambert	20	10 Oct. 1835.
41	Henry O'Connor, Barcostown	Castletown	ditto	R. Malene	20	11 Oct. 1836.

25 March 1837.

G. FetherstonH., Clerk of the Peace,

COUNTY OF WEXFORD.

Name and Residence.	Barony.	Name of Land.	Grantee.	Amount.	Date of Enfranch.
John Barrington, of Rahconlusk.	Ballaghkeene	Rahconlusk - -	affidavit does not state	50	Oct. - 1832.
Rev. Arthur Colley, of Kiltuel	Gorey - -	- - Ballincarrig and Smithstown.	- - ditto - -	20	—
Robert Doyns, jun. of Tullow Cottage.	Ballaghkeene	Wells - - -	- - ditto - -	20	—
Rev. Abraham Goff, of Belville	Gorey - -	Tonnaboley - -	- - ditto - -	20	—
Rev. Walter Greene, of Green Mount.	Searwaleh -	Ballyoriel - -	- - ditto - -	50	—
Henry Irvine, of the city of Dublin.	Bargy - -	Ballyharty - -	- - ditto - -	20	—
William Diggin, of Oulstard	ditto - -	Tullimennen - -	Benjamin Diggin -	20	—
Thomas Boyce, of Grange of Bannow.	ditto - -	Bannow - - -	affidavit does not state	20	—
Martin Kinella, of Ballyconlone.	Gorey - -	Ballyconlone -	James Kinella -	20	—
Thomas Walker, of Bellmount	Forth - -	Little Ballinac -	affidavit does not state	20	—
Charles Arthur Walker, of Bellmount.	ditto - -	- ditto - - -	- - ditto - -	20	—
Wm. Scallan, of Ballyvaloe -	Ballaghkeene	Ballyvaloe - -	- - ditto - -	20	—
James Carpenter, of Dublin -	Shilmaller	Tickillen - - -	- - ditto - -	20	—
George Glascott, of Bannow Lodge.	Shilbarnac -	- - Dungarstown and Kilewon.	John Glascott -	20	—
Wm. Masterson, of Enniscorthy.	Bantry - -	Monglass & Monfin -	Henry Gill - -	20	—
Christopher Atkin, of Ballyroon.	Searwaleh -	Ballyliland - -	William Fackman -	20	—
Richard Nickson Sherwood, of Cooloin.	Gorey - -	Coolroe - - -	Elinor Marfield -	20	—
Lord Viscount Stafford, of Courtown.	Searwaleh -	- Ballybeg and Slieveboy.	affidavit does not state	50	—
John Peare, of Kintown -	Ballaghkeene	Kinnalack - - -	Robert Peare - -	20	29 Dec. 1834.
Henry Beidell, of Rahconslusk.	Searwaleh -	Knockralegary -	Dorothy Braddell -	20	31 Mar. 1835.
John Doyle, of Newtownsherry	- ditto - -	Carrhill - - -	Laurence Doyle -	20	—
Robert Downe, of Barnadown -	Gorey - -	Barnadown - -	Mary Downe - -	20	—
Arthur Kellott, of Wexford -	Ballaghkeene	Mangan - - -	Francis Kellott -	20	—
Hon. Monique Stopford, of Clewton.	- ditto - -	Bollinstan - -	Earl of Courtown -	20	—
Rev. Ephraim Hinson, of Ros-droit Glebe.	Bantry - -	Finshogue - -	Rev. Wm. Hinson -	20	8 Apr. 1835.
Richard F. Heson, of Ballyoriel.	Searwaleh -	Ballyoriel - -	Richard Heson -	20	—
Wm. Lett, of Seafield -	Bargy - -	Duncomack hill -	Charles Lett - -	50	—
John Shudell, of Duncomack	ditto - -	- Wintown and Commons.	Lohan Shudell -	20	—
Paul Whitney, of Permeant -	Bantry - -	Rathmore - - -	affidavit does not state	20	—
Honourable Charles H. Stratford, of 18th regiment.	ditto - -	New Ross - - -	- - ditto - -	50	—
John Richards, of Cooltauf -	Forth - -	Courtnacuddy - -	Rev. George Richards	20	29 June 1835.
William Monk Gibbons, of city of Dublin.	Shilmaller	Ballytramosost -	Henry Percival -	20	—
Edward Barry Lawless, city of Dublin.	Forth - -	- - Lockinstown and Newbay.	- Cadwall. Waddy Roberts.	50	—
John Quinn, of Wingfield -	Gorey - -	Burleigh - - -	Rev. Thos. Quinn -	20	29 Dec. 1835.
Henry Quinn - ditto - -	ditto - -	Pallace - - -	- - ditto - -	20	—
John Webster, of Gorey -	ditto - -	- - Gorey and Knockmullen.	Robert Owen - -	20	2 Apr. 1836.
Rev. David Browning, of Conoin.	ditto - -	Shrubs - - -	John Thos. Browning	20	—
William Sparrow, of Sunhill -	Shilmaller	- - Birchgrove and Sunhill.	Samuel Boxwell -	20	15 Oct. 1836.

Anthony Hawkes, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF WICKLOW.

No.	Sections at which such Receipts were Registered.	Name and Residence of such Person as Registered.	Town.	Division of Land.	Amount Registered, £ s d.	Name of the Person granting Receipts.
1	1st Gen. Registry, 10 Oct. 1834.	Rev. R. J. Brewster, of Greenhall -	Shillelagh	Coolatin-park -	£ 00	
2	Ditto -	Rob. Chaloner, of Coolatin-park -	ditto	Coolatin -	00	Earl Fitzwilliam.
3	Ditto -	William Carke, jun., of Griffithstown -	Upp. Talbotstown	Ballyon -	00	W. Cook, sen.
4	Ditto -	J. W. F. Drought, of Greoga, county Westmeath.	Newcastle	-- Hollyfree and Ballydooleg.	30	G. M. Drought.
5	Ditto -	Moss C. Dennis, of Fortgrene -	Upp. Talbotstown	Kilmarry -	20	Thos. S. Dennis.
6	Ditto -	Masley S. T. Dennis, of ditto -	ditto	ditto -	20	ditto.
7	Ditto -	John H. Fenton, of Ballinacra -	ditto	Strashealy -	20	Richard Fenton.
8	Ditto -	Ralph Howard, of Bushy-park -	ditto	Newtown Sanderson -	50	Hon. H. Howard.
9	Ditto -	G. Hudson, of Mounsjoy-square, Dublin.	ditto	Kelshabeg -	00	R. Hudson.
10	Ditto -	Richard Hudson, of Spring-farm -	ditto	Cranaroe -	20	ditto.
11	Ditto -	W. Kennis, of Ballinacor -	Ballinacor	Farranerin -	20	W. Kennis, sen.
12	Ditto -	Michael M'Donald, of Little Brittas -	Arklow	Little Brittas -	20	J. M'Donald.
13	Ditto -	John Nassau, of Johnstown -	ditto	Ballygiffa -	20	
14	Ditto -	G. H. Newton, of Gorey, county Wexford.	Ballinacor	-- Ballyglan & Garinacore.	20	H. Newton.
15	Ditto -	Benjamin O. Stratford, of Stratford-bridge.	Upp. Talbotstown	Cough -	50	-- Earl of Aldborough.
16	Ditto -	Charles H. Stratford, of ditto -	ditto	ditto -	50	ditto.
17	Ditto -	John Tate, of Cooldellinagart -	Ballinacor	Ballyouragh -	20	Abraham Tate.
18	Ditto -	Abraham Tate, of ditto -	ditto	ditto -	20	ditto.
19	Ditto -	W. J. Wentley, of High-park -	ditto	Knockmoghly -	20	Edw. Wentley.
20	Ditto -	John Wilson, of Rustydul -	Upp. Talbotstown	Knockinragan -	20	
21	East. sess. 1833	John Murray, of Bortlemore -	ditto	Callis -	20	
22	Summ. sess. 1834	William J. Westby, of High-park -	ditto	Kilnacart -	50	Edw. Wentley.
23	Mich. sess. 1834	George Sherwood, of Killmore -	Rathdowne	Ballydoonagh -	20	
24	East. sess. 1835	F. D. Darrington, of Ballyhoey -	Newcastle	Balford -	20	
25	Ditto -	Hon. C. H. Stratford, 18th regt.	Upp. Talbotstown	Conglewe -	50	-- Earl of Aldborough.
26	Mich. sess. 1835	Henry Wilson, of Rathnallagh -	ditto	Rathnallagh -	20	
27	Ditto -	Robert Tottenham, of Ballyearry -	Newcastle	Ballymoan -	00	Chas. Tottenham.
28	Ditto -	C. Tottenham, jun., New Ross, county Wexford.	ditto	ditto -	00	ditto.
29	Ditto -	Henry Quin, of Wingfield -	Arklow	Ballyconelli -	20	Rev. T. Quin.
30	Ditto -	John Quin, of ditto -	ditto	ditto -	20	ditto.
31	Ditto -	Rev. Richard Quin, of Arnoagh -	ditto	ditto -	20	ditto.
32	Ditto -	T. Kennis, of Kildare-street, Dublin -	ditto	Ballymorris -	50	W. Kennis, sen.
33	Ditto -	Richard Kennis, of ditto -	Ballinacor	Farranerin -	20	ditto.
34	Ditto -	G. R. Hoey, of Laxson-street, Dublin -	Rathdowne	Ballydoonagh -	50	W. Parsons Hoey.
35	Ill., Sept. 1836	George Hopensall, of Altadore -	Arklow	Ceanagower -	50	-- Rev. L. W. Hopensall.
36	Ditto -	R. H. Hoey, of Summer-hill Parade -	Low. Talbotstown	-- Donkore, Fairp. Opreag, Dooonagh -	50	Darby O'Reilly.
37	Ditto -	G. R. Hoey, of Fairview Avenue -	ditto	ditto -	50	ditto.
38	Ditto -	S. Manning, of Clare street, Dublin -	Arklow	Threemilewater -	50	
39	Ditto -	Michael Cook, of Griffithstown -	Upp. Talbotstown	Griffinstown -	20	W. Cook, sen.
40	East. sess. 1836	Rev. James F. C. Sanders, of Baeris, county Carlow.	ditto	Eaststown -	20	
41	Summ. sess. 1836	George Hopensall, of Altadore -	Arklow	Carnagower -	20	-- Rev. L. W. Hopensall.
42	Mich. sess. 1836	William Grogan, of Shurey-park -	Upp. Talbotstown	Fryastown -	20	Rev. W. Grogan.
43	Ditto -	John Grogan, of ditto -	ditto	ditto -	20	ditto.
44	Ditto -	George Hatchell, of Ludford-park -	Arklow	Scratta -	20	John Hatchell.
45	Ditto -	B. B. Johnson, Dame-street, Dublin -	Upp. Talbotstown	Knockaderry -	20	Rev. H. Johnson.
46	Ditto -	W. Lamb, of Mounsjoy-square -	Newcastle	Willowgrove -	20	
47	Ditto -	Andrew H. O'Reilly, of Kilquade -	ditto	Kilquade -	20	John T. O'Reilly.
48	May sess. 1837	Rev. B. H. Johnson Magaurney, co. Cork.	Upp. Talbotstown	Knockaderry -	20	Rev. H. Johnson.

1 April 1837.

Samuel Foster, Dep. Clerk of the Peace.

Appendix (D.)

Appendix (D.)
Assistant
Barristers.

My Lord,

I AM commanded by the Lord Lieutenant to transmit herewith, in obedience to an order of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, on Fictitious Votes, Ireland, dated 14th February 1837, a Return of the Names of the Deputy Assistant Barristers appointed under the authority of the 2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 66, s. 66, &c.

Dublin Castle, 6 April 1837.

Lord Granville Somerset,
&c. &c. &c.

I have, &c.
T. Dransford.

A RETURN of the Names of the DEPUTY ASSISTANT BARRISTERS appointed under the Authority of the 2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 66, s. 66; the Names and Dates of the Appointment of all Assistant Barristers appointed since the 1st January 1833, and the Causes of the Vacancies which may have been thus supplied; the Names and Dates of the Removals of all the Assistant Barristers who may have been removed from one County to another since the 1st January 1833; also specifying the Places to which they may have been Removed.

NAMES of the DEPUTY ASSISTANT BARRISTERS appointed under the Authority of
2 & 3 Will. IV. c. 66, s. 66.

J. W. Ardill.	Arthur French.	James Mengon.
Christopher Antisell.	Phillip Fogarty.	Robert D. M'Creedy.
Thomas Abbott.	Malachy Fallon.	Eohin Molyneux.
Henry William Arabin.	John Guthrie.	John M. Mulcahy.
William Armstrong.	Patrick Gahan.	James Moody.
Francis Beatty.	Walter H. Griffith.	Lewellen Nash.
Francis Ball.	James Hawkins.	John O'Dwyer.
Robert Blakeney.	Thomas H. Henley.	Nicholas P. O'Gorman.
John Beeson.	William E. Hudson.	Joseph Radcliffe.
Francis Burke.	Arthur Hamilton.	Henry Rercell.
John Brooke.	George O. Irwin.	Hartstonge Robinson.
Thomas Bush.	Daniel R. Kane.	Carew Saayth.
John Chambers.	Richard Kellett.	Edward Scriven.
D. R. Courtney.	Maurice King.	Joseph Stock.
John R. Coehall.	R. H. Langrahe.	David Thompson.
John D. Clarke.	Richard J. Lane.	Richard C. Walker.
Thomas Cosgrave.	Cornelius Lyne.	Hotwell Walsh.
Robert Day.	Acheson Lyle.	Anthony Willis.
James Dogherty.	Francis Magun.	John Fosbery.
Conway E. Dobbs.	J. B. Miller.	
Thomas W. Fitzgerald.	John Mackay.	

Dublin Castle, 4 April 1837.

T. Dransford.

NAMES and Dates of the Appointment of all ASSISTANT BARRISTERS appointed since the
1st January 1833, and the Causes of the Vacancies which may have been thus supplied.

NAMES.	DATE of Appointment.	CAUSE OF VACANCY.
N. P. O'Gorman	5 Feb. 1834	death of S. Curry, esq.
Malachy Fallon	21 Nov. —	resignation of Robert Johnstone, esq.
P. M. Murphy	—	death of W. P. Cruise, esq.
J. W. Lendrick	30 Jan. 1835	resignation of J. D. Jackson, esq.
Hartstonge Robinson	—	death of Edward Scott, esq.
James Moody	25 May —	promotion of Mr. Farrell to be a Commissioner of Insolvents.
Acheson Lyle	17 Oct. —	death of S. M. Hobson, esq.
Phillip Fogarty	23 Dec. —	death of Edward O'Grady, esq.
John Gibson	—	promotion of A. Lyle to be Second Remembrancer.
Walter Berrick	29 Dec. —	death of Eccles Cuthbert, esq.
J. Baldwin	—	promotion of Mr. W. H. Curran to be a Commissioner of Insolvents.
W. E. Hudson	16 June 1838	promotion of J. M'Cann to be Commissioner of Bankrupts.
D. R. Kane	10 Dec. —	death of James T. Hall, esq.

Dublin Castle, 4 April 1837.

T. Dransford.

NAMES and Dates of the Removals of all the ASSISTANT BARRISTERS who may have been removed from one County to another since the 1st of January 1833, specifying the Places to which they may have been Removed.

Appendix (D.)
Assistant
Barristers.

NAMES.	REMOVED		DATE of REMOVAL.
	FROM	TO	
William Mayne -	Westmeath	Antrim	4 Feb. - 1834
Ditto -	Antrim	Mayo	23 Dec. - 1835
James Bessonett -	Carlow	Fermanagh	30 Jan. -
Hartstonge Robinson -	Ditto	Sligo	23 Dec. -
James Moody -	Westmeath	Carlow	-
Ditto -	Carlow	W. R. Cork	2 April - 1836
Henry J. Baldwin	Waterford	Carlow	-
Ditto -	Carlow	Wexford	16 June -
James Major -	Cavan	Monaghan	23 Dec. - 1836
James T. Hall -	Monaghan	Cavan	-
P. M. Murphy -	Limerick	Kerry	-
Ditto -	Kerry	Carrig	10 Dec. - 1836
W. D. Freeman	Ditto	Galway	24 Dec. - 1835
John Finlay -	Leitrim	Kerry	10 Dec. - 1836
N. P. O'Gorman	Westmeath	Kilkenny	20 May - 1835
John Howley -	King's	Tipperary	17 Oct. -
Malschy Fallon	Mayo	Limerick	23 Dec. -
William H. Ellis	Sligo	Westmeath	-
Walter Berwick	Waterford	W. R. Cork	29 Dec. -

Dublin Castle, 4 April 1837.

T. Dransfield.

Appendix (E.)

A RETURN of the Number of Notices of APPEALS made at each Registering Session, since the passing of the Irish Reform Act, "to REGISTER VOTERS in each County, City and Town in Ireland," together with the Number of such Claimants, admitted, rejected, or withdrawn, distinguishing the same into Classes, and in Cases of Rejection, the Number of Decisions of the Assistant or Registering Barristers appealed against, the Grounds of Appeal and the Judgment thereon.

Appendix (E.)
Notices of Appeals
Filed to Register
Voters.

SCHEDULE.

Antrim County.	Drogheda County Town.	Limerick County.	Queen's County.
Armagh County.	Fermanagh County.	Limerick City.	Rockingham County.
Belfast Borough.	Galway County.	Lisburn Borough.	Sligo County.
Carrickfergus Town.	Galway Town.	Londonderry County & City.	Tipperary County.
Cavan County.	Kerry County.	Longford County.	Waterford County.
Clare County.	Kildare County.	Louth County.	Waterford City.
Cork County.	Kilkenny County.	Mayo County.	Westmeath County.
Cork City.	Kilkenny City.	Monaghan County.	Wexford County.
Donegal County.	King's County.	Monaghan County.	Wicklow County.
Down County.	Leitrim County.		

COUNTY OF ANTRIM.

DATE OF REGISTRY.	Number of Notices.	Number Admitted.	Number Rejected.	Number Withdrawn.	Number Appeals.	Grounds of Appeal and Judgment.
October & November 1833	5,140	3,608	61	1,477	-	None.
January 1833	-	28	-	-	-	
April -	445	137	-	-	-	
July -	-	28	-	-	-	
October -	-	37	-	-	-	
January 1834	-	27	-	-	-	
April -	37	21	5	-	-	
July -	-	7	1	19	-	
October -	71	22	-	-	-	
January 1835	-	11	-	-	-	
April -	29	11	-	-	-	
July -	138	47	5	88	-	
October -	78	16	3	53	-	
January 1836	306	63	5	138	-	
April -	87	24	2	61	-	
July -	121	37	5	39	-	
October -	79	31	8	30	-	
January 1837	104	31	3	30	-	
	28	10	-	18	-	

20 March 1837.

S. Doran, Clerk of the Peace.

ARMAGH.

Appendix (E.)

Notices of Applications to Register Voters.

Date of Publication of Notices also passing of Returns Act.	Number of Claims.	Number Admitted.	Number Rejected or Withdrawn.	Number Appeared from.
1830:				
27 September - - - - -	4,606	3,241	1,065	
14 December - - - - -	654			
18 - - - - -	240			
21 - - - - -	53			
1831:				
19 March - - - - -	32	9	23	
14 June - - - - -	10			
11 - - - - -	41			
1 October - - - - -	17			
11 - - - - -	4	8	13	
13 December - - - - -	1			
1834:				
18 March - - - - -	72	22	51	
25 - - - - -	1			
3 June - - - - -	13			
30 September - - - - -	15			
16 December - - - - -	24	19	20	None.
19 - - - - -	15			
1835:				
13 March - - - - -	42	28	82	
27 - - - - -	62			
9 June - - - - -	29			
12 - - - - -	30			
22 September - - - - -	90	9	24	
8 October - - - - -	13			
15 December - - - - -	13			
22 - - - - -	14			
1836:				
15 March - - - - -	26	17	62	
19 - - - - -	53			
7 June - - - - -	6			
21 - - - - -	3			
27 September - - - - -	6	10	5	
6 October - - - - -	8			
17 December - - - - -	41			
22 - - - - -	47			

1 March 1837.

Leonard Debbin, Jun., Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF BELFAST.

Date of Registry.	Number of Notices.	Number Admitted.	Number Rejected.	Number Withdrawn.	Number of Appeals.	Grounds of Appeal and Judgment.
October & Nov. 1830	3,366	1,500	180	1,518		
January 1832	4	4	—	—		
April - - - - -	411	94	15	302		
July - - - - -	375	56	3	316		
October - - - - -	355	68	3	284		
January 1834	266	41	1	224		
April - - - - -	385	65	6	304		
July - - - - -	419	81	8	330		
October - - - - -	467	69	2	396		
January 1835	487	107	4	376		
April - - - - -	814	159	77	535	5	- - on the ledger part of the issue entry being cancelled by appellants, without order reversed in such case, by Judge Johnson.
July - - - - -	651	122	23	506		
October - - - - -	822	131	15	746		
January 1836	815	207	16	592		
April - - - - -	673	161	23	489	1	- - counting-house, allowed by Chief Justice Barke. - - not determined yet.
July - - - - -	672	90	11	571		
October - - - - -	651	191	27	433	2	
January 1837	772	226	20	526		
	10,425	2,621	448	8,404	10	

16 March 1837.

S. Doreux, Clerk of the Peace.

BOROUGH OF CARRICKFERGUS.

Session at which Applications were made.	Great Number of Applications.	Number Admitted.	Number Rejected.	Number withdrawn on Duplication and Non-attendance.	Number of Rejections Appealed against / Grounds of Appeal and Judgment thereon.
Special Sessions, October 1832	1,071	1,068	30	623	- - No rejections were appealed against.
Sessions, January - 1833	78	38	-	40	
June - - - - -	14	14	-	-	
October - - - - -	245	118	-	158	
January - 1834	428	218	1	100	
June - - - - -	4	3	-	1	
January - 1835	3	3	-	-	
June - - - - -	14	12	-	2	
July - - - - -	3	2	-	1	
January - 1837	50	13	1	16	
TOTALS - - -	2,491	1,459	22	1,010	

March 1837.

Adam Cunningham, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF CAVAN.

SESSIONS.	Number of Notices.	Number Admitted.	Number Withdrawn and not appearing.	Insufficiency of Value.	Rejected for Want of Title.	Inadmissibility for Defect of Notice.	Number of Decisions appealed against			Grounds of Appeal.	Judgment on Appeal.
							On Value.	On Title.	On Form or Notice.		
1832: October - Special Registry	4,925	2,248	1,070	145	70	54	-	none.			
1833: Hilary - Bailieborough	251	10	187	21	3	1	-	none.			
Cavan - - - - -	135	8	123	4	-	-	-	none.			
April - Ballyconnell -	7	0	5	-	-	-	-	none.			
Cote-hill - - - - -	55	8	16	-	1	-	-	none.			
Summer - Bailieborough	10	4	5	1	-	-	-	none.			
Cavan - - - - -	25	10	19	2	1	-	-	none.			
October - Ballyconnell -	28	0	14	5	-	-	-	none.			
Cote-hill - - - - -	12	2	10	-	-	-	-	none.			
1834: Hilary - Bailieborough	10	4	5	1	-	-	-	none.			
Cavan - - - - -	7	3	4	-	-	-	-	none.			
Easter - Ballyconnell -	7	1	4	2	-	-	-	none.			
Cote-hill - - - - -	5	1	4	-	-	-	-	none.			
Summer - Bailieborough	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	none.			
Cavan - - - - -	3	2	1	-	-	-	-	none.			
October - Ballyconnell -	9	4	2	-	-	3	-	none.			
Cote-hill - - - - -	3	1	1	-	-	-	-	none.			
1835: Hilary - Bailieborough	28	4	17	7	-	-	-	none.			
Cavan - - - - -	26	13	23	-	-	-	-	none.			
Easter - Ballyconnell -	26	8	13	2	1	-	-	none.			
Cote-hill - - - - -	2	4	2	-	-	1	-	none.			
Summer - Bailieborough	25	12	9	-	1	-	-	none.			
Cavan - - - - -	29	13	16	2	-	-	-	none.			
October - Cote-hill - - - - -	5	2	2	-	-	-	-	none.			
Ballyconnell -	30	14	13	3	-	-	-	none.			
1836: Hilary - Bailieborough	6	3	2	-	-	-	-	none.			
Cavan - - - - -	23	11	13	-	-	-	-	none.			
Easter - Cote-hill - - - - -	7	3	4	-	-	-	-	none.			
Ballyconnell -	9	5	3	-	1	-	-	none.			
Summer - Bailieborough	7	1	5	-	1	-	-	none.			
Cavan - - - - -	11	6	3	-	2	-	-	none.			
October - Cote-hill - - - - -	248	24	201	16	3	4	4	no attendance			
Ballyconnell -	609	46	517	25	12	5	-	none.			
1837: Hilary - Bailieborough	653	26	228	19	6	5	2	8	9	0*	
Cavan - - - - -	1,386	306	952	53	44	31	8	11	3†		

* One only appeared to prosecute his appeal, and on full hearing his claim was disallowed by verdict of jury.

† At Cavan one only appeared to prosecute his appeal, and on full hearing his claim was disallowed by verdict of a jury.

15 March 1837.

Edward L. Moyn, Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

239.

r

COUNTY OF CLARE.

Year.	When Sessions are held.	Number of Notices of Applications to Register.	Number of Claimants Admitted.	Number of Claimants Rejected or Withdrawn.	Number of Deceaseds Appealed against.	Grounds of Appeal.	Judgment thereon at the Assize.
1832	Special sessions under Reform Act.	3,813	2,378	1,295			
1833	Hilary sessions -	159	53	100			
-	Easter -	146	30	107			
-	Summer -	224	58	166			
-	October -	80	15	64			
1834	Hilary -	61	24	37			
-	Easter -	23	9	14			
-	Summer -	26	7	19			
-	October -	25	7	18	5	- voters claiming to have the qualification required.	- no appearance by applicants.
1835	Hilary -	955	22	173			
-	Easter -	201	57	144			
-	Summer -	71	23	48	11	- ditto -	5 registered and 9 withdrawn.
-	October -	45	13	32			
1836	Hilary -	70	22	48			
-	Easter -	86	35	51			
-	Summer -	44	13	31			
-	October -	31	10	21			
1837	Hilary -	369	156	213	30	- ditto -	5 registered, and 25 rejected or withdrawn.
	Total -	5,722	3,741	2,321	46	- - -	7 withdrawn.

6 March 1837.

William Kern, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF CORK.

DATE OF EACH REGISTERING SESSION.	Number of Notices of Applicants.	Number Admitted.	Rejected.	Withdrawn, or non-appearance.	Number of Appeals.	Ground of Appeal.	Judgment thereon.
At the special registry session held, under the 14th section of the Irish Reform Act, in October and November 1832.	14,824	3,054	269	10,601			
West Riding:							
Bandon session 1833		34	7	5	12		
Macroon - - - - -		126	9	5	112		
Bantry - 1834		26	3	-	23		
Skihbeen - - - - -		3	-	-	1		
Clonsilla - - - - -		43	-	-	43		
Bandon - - - - -		26	5	-	21		
Macroon - - - - -		19	5	1	13		
Bantry - 1835		7	2	-	5		
Skihbeen - - - - -		465	106	42	317		
Clonsilla - - - - -		107	21	9	77		
Bandon - - - - -		122	20	23	149		
Macroon - - - - -		353	56	26	270		
Bantry - 1836		178	16	4	158		
Skihbeen - - - - -		440	57	14	378		
Clonsilla - - - - -		309	17	9	283		

DATE OF EACH REGISTERING SESSION.	Number of Notices of Applicants.	Number Admitted.	Rejected.	Withdrawn or Dis-appearance.	Number of Appeals.	Grounds of Appeal.	Judgment thereon.
<i>West Riding—continued.</i>							
Baden session 1836	348	17	13	298			
Macroom - - - - -	204	34	10	150			
Bantry - - - - - 1837	170	11	6	153			
<i>East Riding :</i>							
Ferriby session 1833	20	4	-	16			
Mallow - - - - -	3	-	-	3			
Kestak - - - - -	21	8	-	13			
Cock - - - - -	51	4	-	40			
Middleton - - - - -	30	11	2	26			
Ferriby - - - - - 1834	14	-	-	14			
Mallow - - - - -	250	14	6	240			
Kestak - - - - -	3	-	-	3			
Cork - - - - -	20	7	-	22			
Middleton - - - - -	2	-	-	2			
Ferriby - - - - - 1835	14	4	-	10			
Mallow - - - - -	207	25	9	173			
Kestak - - - - -	251	29	5	217			
Cork - - - - -	212	-	-	212			
Middleton - - - - -	600	47	27	516	5	inad- visibility of value.	- former decision confirm- ed.
Ferriby - - - - - 1836	228	36	9	243			
Mallow - - - - -	221	21	5	205			
Kestak - - - - -	250	9	1	250			
Cork - - - - -	222	41	9	232			
Middleton - - - - -	270	116	64	177			
Ferriby - - - - - 1837	325	26	11	348			

Appendix (E)
Notices of Applica-
tions to Register
Voters.

Peace Office, }
3 March 1837. }

James Chafferton,
Clerk of the Peace.

CITY OF CORK.

SESSIONS.	Number of Notices of Applicants.	Admitted.	Rejected.	Withdrawn or Dis-appearance.	Number of Dis- missals reported.	Grounds of Appeal.	Judgment thereon.	Observations.
Special sess. Oct. 1835	2,610	4,302	337	2,651	1	-- from the order of rejection by the deputy assistant barrister, on the ground of being a freeman not resident within seven statute miles of the usual place of election.	-- admitted to register.	
Middleton sess. Nov. -	110	-	-	-	-	-	-	-- the special session in Oct. 1835 not having terminated, the barrister declined registering any of these applicants.
Ferriby sess. Jan. 1833	15	-	-	15	-	-	-	
Mallow sess. April -	24	3	-	21	-	-	-	
Kestak sess. June -	4	-	-	4	-	-	-	
Cock sess. Sept. -	208	97	24	137	-	-	-	
Middleton sess. Nov. -	16	2	1	13	-	-	-	
Ferriby sess. Jan. 1834	17	1	-	16	-	-	-	
Mallow sess. April -	10	-	-	10	-	-	-	
Kestak sess. June -	14	-	-	14	-	-	-	
Cock sess. Sept. -	113	43	5	65	-	-	-	
Middleton sess. Nov. -	21	-	-	21	-	-	-	
Ferriby sess. Jan. 1835	13	1	1	11	-	-	-	
Mallow sess. April -	250	136	13	210	-	-	-	
Kestak sess. June -	257	69	8	186	-	-	-	

SESSIONS.	Number of Notices of Applications.	Admitted.	Rejected.	Withdrawn, or Was Appeared.	Number of Defendants against.	Grounds of Appeal.	Judgment thereon.	Observation.
Cork sess. Sept. 1835	1,887	448	909	1,830	74	-- from the order of rejection by the assistant barrister, on the ground of some of the apartments in the houses out of which the parties applied to be registered being set to lodgers.	-- admitted to register.	
Middleton sess. Nov. -	258	04	12	181	3	-- from the like order, on the ground of some of the premises out of which the person applied to be registered not being of the clear yearly value of 10 l.	-- admitted to register.	-- a jury was sworn to try the value of the premises.
Fermoy sess. Jan. 1836	238	60	16	254				
Mallow sess. April -	397	70	10	347	1	-- from the like order, on the grounds of applicant's rates not being paid.	-- rejected.	
Kantirk sess. June -	171	43	2	126	1	-- from the like order, on the grounds of applicant not being in possession at the time he alleged.	-- admitted to register.	
Cork sess. Sept. -	303	146	38	759				
Middleton sess. Nov. -	214	48	4	160				
Fermoy sess. Jan. 1837	313	46	14	153				
TOTAL - -	14,350	3,640	696	7,835	81			

Peace Office, }
11 March 1837. }

John Collins,
Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF DONEGAL.

Period of Quarter Sessions.	Number of Notices served at each Session.	Number Registered.	Number Rejected.	Number Withdrawn.	Number Appealed against.	Ground of Appeal, and Judgment thereon.
At general registering sessions, October 1832	2,263	1,443	150	651	2	-- these appeals were not proceeded with before the judge of assize by the persons appealing.
Hilary sessions 1833	47	10	3	34	3	-- the persons appealing at these sessions were rejected by the assistant barrister on the ground of want of value; his decision was reversed before the judge, and the appellants were registered.
Easter - - -	623	77	29	516		
Summer - - -	175	14	1	160		
Michaelmas - - -	70	24	2	44	1	-- these appellants were rejected by the assistant barrister, on value; this decision was affirmed before the judge in the five cases.
Hilary - - - 1834	27	6	3	18		
Easter - - -	3	-	-	3		
Summer - - -	32	4	3	25		
Michaelmas - - -	78	20	11	47	4	
Hilary - - - 1835	79	9	31	39		
Easter - - -	162	36	15	111		
Summer - - -	57	20	6	12		
Michaelmas - - -	20	11	2	7		
Hilary - - - 1836	40	13	8	23		
Easter - - -	148	21	15	112		
Summer - - -	66	6	5	55		
Michaelmas - - -	251	73	37	141		
Hilary - - - 1837	428	95	58	278		
	4,578	1,603	388	2,287	10	

Note.—In the foregoing Returns, the number appearing registered in the county is different from what appears in the Return of Voters; the reason of this is, that several 50 l. freeholders were registered at each session without having served notices, their affidavits being sworn before a judge in Dublin, or so circuit.

Peace Office, Lifford, }
11 March 1837. }

James Collins,
Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF DOWN.

Appendix (E.)

Notices of Applications to Register Votes.

Number of Notices of Applications to Register Votes.	REGISTERING SESSIONS.			CLAIMANTS.			Number of Elections of the Assistant or Registering Officers Appealed against.	Grounds of Appeal.	Judgment on Appeal.
				Number Admitted.	Number Rejected.	Number withdrawn, or not having appeared.			
4,521	Downpatrick, 10 Oct. 1833	558	-	-	1,318				
	Newtownards, 15 - -	225	-	-					
	Hillsborough, 17 - -	381	-	-					
	Newry - - 10 - -	205	-	-					
	Downpatrick, 25 - -	508	-	-					
	Newtownards, 31 - -	183	-	-					
	Hillsborough, 5 Nov. -	315	1	-					
58	Newry - - 9 - -	504	2	-					
18	Newtownards, 28 Dec. -	35	2	61					
26	Hillsborough, 3 Jan. 1833	16	-	-	96				
7	Downpatrick, 27 March -	13	-	-	23				
35	Newry - - 3 April -	4	-	-	3				
40	Newtownards, 18 June -	8	-	-	27				
35	Hillsborough, 24 - -	24	1	-	15				
8	Downpatrick, 14 Oct. -	23	1	-	11				
4	Newry - - 21 - -	3	-	-	5				
5	Newtownards, 28 Dec. -	3	1	-	-				
13	Hillsborough, 3 Jan. 1834	-	-	-	5				
22	Downpatrick, 31 March -	9	2	-	2				
12	Newry - - 7 April -	4	-	-	18				
3	Newtownards, 17 June -	5	-	-	6				
41	Hillsborough, 23 - -	1	-	-	2				
36	Downpatrick, 13 Oct. -	14	-	-	27				
5	Newry - - 21 - -	10	2	-	24				
10	Newtownards, 29 Dec. -	1	-	-	4				
69	Hillsborough, 3 Jan. 1835	2	1	-	7				
16	Downpatrick, 30 March -	8	-	-	61				
3	Newry - - 6 April -	6	2	-	8				
10	Newtownards, 23 June -	3	-	-	-				
3	Hillsborough, 29 - -	7	-	-	3				
4	Downpatrick, 12 Oct. -	1	-	-	2				
6	Newry - - 20 - -	2	-	-	2				
3	Newtownards, 29 Dec. -	2	-	-	4				
9	Hillsborough, 4 Jan. 1836	3	-	-	-				
9	Downpatrick, 28 March -	7	-	-	2				
9	Newry - - 4 April -	6	-	-	3				
5	Newtownards, 21 June -	5	-	-	4				
113	Hillsborough, 27 - -	3	-	-	2				
207	Downpatrick, 10 Oct. -	39	9	-	84				
87	Newry - - 18 - -	49	17	-	141				
107	Newtownards, 27 Dec. -	46	3	-	38				
	Hillsborough, 2 Jan. 1837	49	7	-	60				

10 March 1837.

J. & H. Craig, Clerks of the Peace.

COUNTY OF FERMANAGH.

	Chasms.	Admitt.	Rejected.	Withdrawn.		Chasms.	Admitt.	Rejected.	Withdrawn.	
October Sessions, 1832:					October Sessions, 1834:					
50 freeholders -	231	173	6	52	50 freeholders -	1	4	-	-	- 2 registered without notice.
20 leaseholders -	40	31	1	18	20 leaseholders -	2	3	-	-	- 1
20 freeholders -	309	229	5	84	20 freeholders -	5	4	-	-	- 1
10 leaseholders -	50	33	-	17	10 leaseholders -	6	3	-	-	- 1
10 freeholders -	1291	975	15	301	10 freeholders -	82	38	4	40	- no appeals.
50 rentchargers -	3	3	-	-	50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	-
20 rentchargers -	17	5	-	12	20 rentchargers -	2	1	1	-	-
Hilary Sessions, 1833:					Hilary Sessions, 1835:					
50 freeholders -	3	3	-	-	50 freeholders -	1	2	-	-	- 1 registered without notice.
20 leaseholders -	1	1	-	-	20 leaseholders -	1	-	-	-	- 1
20 freeholders -	14	6	1	7	20 freeholders -	4	1	-	-	- 3
10 leaseholders -	13	3	2	8	10 leaseholders -	1	-	-	-	- 1
10 freeholders -	62	26	7	29	10 freeholders -	20	14	1	6	- no appeals.
50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	-
20 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	20 rentchargers -	1	1	-	-	-
Easter Sessions, 1833:					Easter Sessions, 1835:					
50 freeholders -	14	11	-	3	50 freeholders -	3	5	-	-	- 2 registered without notice.
20 leaseholders -	-	-	-	-	20 leaseholders -	-	-	-	-	-
20 freeholders -	6	3	-	3	20 freeholders -	3	1	1	1	- no appeals.
10 leaseholders -	1	1	-	1	10 leaseholders -	9	1	3	5	-
10 freeholders -	28	8	-	20	10 freeholders -	64	18	10	36	-
50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	-
20 rentchargers -	1	1	-	-	20 rentchargers -	2	2	-	-	-
Summer Sessions, 1833:					Summer Sessions, 1835:					
50 freeholders -	-	-	-	-	50 freeholders -	3	7	-	1	- 5 registered without notice.
20 leaseholders -	-	-	-	-	20 leaseholders -	1	1	-	-	-
20 freeholders -	-	-	-	-	20 freeholders -	2	2	-	-	-
10 leaseholders -	-	-	-	-	10 leaseholders -	1	-	-	-	-
10 freeholders -	1	-	-	1	10 freeholders -	15	6	2	7	- no appeals.
50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	-
20 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	20 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	-
October Sessions, 1833:					October Sessions, 1835:					
50 freeholders -	1	1	-	-	50 freeholders -	3	3	-	-	-
20 leaseholders -	-	-	-	-	20 leaseholders -	1	-	-	-	- 1
20 freeholders -	2	1	-	1	20 freeholders -	9	4	2	3	- no appeals.
10 leaseholders -	1	-	-	1	10 leaseholders -	-	-	-	-	-
10 freeholders -	60	15	-	8	10 freeholders -	141	49	21	71	-
50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	-
20 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	20 rentchargers -	3	1	1	1	-
Hilary Sessions, 1834:					Hilary Sessions, 1836:					
50 freeholders -	1	3	-	-	50 freeholders -	6	8	-	-	- 2 registered without notice.
20 leaseholders -	-	-	-	-	20 leaseholders -	1	-	-	-	- 1
20 freeholders -	3	2	-	1	20 freeholders -	8	5	-	3	- no appeals.
10 leaseholders -	1	-	-	-	10 leaseholders -	5	2	-	3	-
10 freeholders -	1	-	-	1	10 freeholders -	103	29	6	68	-
50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	-
20 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	20 rentchargers -	3	1	-	2	-
Easter Sessions, 1834:					Easter Sessions, 1836:					
50 freeholders -	2	2	-	-	50 freeholders -	6	7	-	-	- 1 registered without notice.
20 leaseholders -	1	-	-	1	20 leaseholders -	-	-	-	-	-
20 freeholders -	4	-	-	4	20 freeholders -	7	4	-	3	- no appeals.
10 leaseholders -	4	-	-	4	10 leaseholders -	10	7	1	9	-
10 freeholders -	12	-	-	12	10 freeholders -	99	54	15	50	-
50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	-
20 rentchargers -	1	-	-	-	20 rentchargers -	1	1	-	-	-
Summer Sessions, 1834:					Summer Sessions, 1836:					
50 freeholders -	1	3	-	-	50 freeholders -	2	4	-	-	- 2 registered without notice.
20 leaseholders -	1	1	-	-	20 leaseholders -	-	-	-	-	-
20 freeholders -	7	2	-	5	20 freeholders -	1	-	-	-	- 1
10 leaseholders -	5	3	-	2	10 leaseholders -	-	-	-	-	-
10 freeholders -	63	25	6	31	10 freeholders -	12	3	2	7	- no appeals.
50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	50 rentchargers -	-	-	-	-	-
20 rentchargers -	2	1	-	1	20 rentchargers -	2	-	-	-	-

	Claimants.	Admitted.	Rejected.	Withdrawn.		Claimants.	Admitted.	Rejected.	Withdrawn.	
£. October Sessions, 1836:						£. Hilary Sessions, 1836-7:				
50 freeholders -	3	3	-	-	no appeals.	50 freeholders -	4	4	-	no appeals.
50 leaseholders -	4	2	-	-		50 leaseholders -	1	-	-	
20 freeholders -	2	1	-	-		50 freeholders -	-	-	-	
10 leaseholders -	2	-	-	-		10 leaseholders -	1	-	-	
10 freeholders -	24	3	-	21		50 freeholders -	20	6	-	
50 leaseholders -	-	-	-	-		50 leaseholders -	-	-	-	
50 freeholders -	1	1	-	-		20 leaseholders -	2	2	-	
50 leaseholders -	-	-	-	-		20 leaseholders -	-	-	-	
50 freeholders -	-	-	-	-		20 leaseholders -	-	-	-	
50 leaseholders -	-	-	-	-		20 leaseholders -	-	-	-	

No Appeals in this country.

Adam Nixon, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY GALWAY.

Number of Notices of Application to Register.	NUMBER ADMITTED.	NUMBER REJECTED, with CAUSE OF REJECTION.	Number Withdrawn, or who did not come forward to Register.	APPEALS from the Register's Decisions.
Number of Applications to register at first sessions held under the Act, which sessions commenced on the 10th day of October 1839, and ended at Ballinasloe on the 8th day of November 1839:	3,674	3,684	5,584	
Loughrea Sessions, 2 January 1833:	13	4	8	
Eye Court Sessions, 25 March 1833:	183	9	171	
Galway Sessions, 4 April 1833:	159	11	158	
Loughrea Sessions, 18 June 1833:	93	19	72	
Tam Sessions, 26 June 1833:	137	6	131	
Gort, 14 October 1833:	103	8	95	none.
Galway, 29 October 1833:	47	6	36	
Loughrea, 27 December 1833:	159	43	114	
Tam Sessions, 4 January 1834:	83	33	50	
Eye Court Sessions, 31 March 1834:	118	78	39	
Galway Sessions, 8 April 1834:	85	34	49	
Loughrea Sessions, 18 June 1834:	39	3	31	
Tam Sessions, 26 June 1834:	213	82	144	

Appendix (E.)
Notices of Applications to Register Voters.

Number of Notices of Applications to Register.	NUMBER ADMITTED.	NUMBER REJECTED, with CAUSE OF REJECTION.	Number Withdrawn, or who did not come forward to Register.	APPEALS from the Registrar's Decision.
Gort, 14 October 1834: 65	2	-- none - - - - -	63	
Galway, 22 October 1834: 99	21	-- 1, for insufficiency of value in freehold.	78	
Loughrea Sessions, 27 December 1834: 140	16	-- 1, rejected for want of sufficient value in his freehold.	124	
Tuan Sessions, 5 January 1835: 63	17	-- 1, rejected, not proving title to his freehold.	46	
Eyre Court Sessions, 30 March 1835: 48	13	-- none - - - - -	35	
Galway Sessions, 7 April 1835: 91	8	-- none - - - - -	83	
Loughrea Sessions, 5 June 1835: 60	20	-- 1, for not being in possession of freehold. 1, for not being six months in possession.	-	none.
Tuan Sessions, 30 June 1835: 57	21	-- 2, for not being six months in possession. 2, for insufficiency of value in freehold.	36	
Gort Sessions, 14 October 1835: 55	30	-- none - - - - -	25	
Galway Sessions, October 1835: 43	6	-- none - - - - -	17	
Loughrea Sessions, 18 December 1835: 55	1	-- 1, for insufficiency of value in freehold.	54	
Tuan Sessions, 5 January 1836: 24	5	-- 2, for insufficiency of value in freehold.	17	
Eyre Court, 30 March 1836: 101	none	-- 2, rejected for insufficiency of value	101	-- 1, against rejection for insufficiency of value, decided in favour of claimant to vote.
Galway, 4 April 1836: 13	5	- - - - -	7	
Loughrea, 20 June 1836: 45	17	-- 3, for insufficient value - - 1, for not producing deed of assignment under which he claimed to vote. 2, for not being six months in possession.	22	
Tuan, 28 June 1836: 22	3	-- 2, for insufficiency of value - - 1, for not being six months in possession.	16	none.
Gort, October 1836: 1	none	-- none - - - - -	1	
Galway, 25 October 1836: 454	6	-- none - - - - -	448	
Loughrea, 28 December 1836: 120	41	-- 4, for insufficiency in value - - 2, for not having their leases.	75	
Tuan Sessions, 5 January 1837: 133	4	-- 4, for insufficiency of value - 1, lease not legible. 7, having their notice wrong - 1, same cause.	116	

James Kelly, Clerk of the Peace.

PLACES and SESSIONS.	Total Number of Claimants.	ADMITTED.					REJECTED.					WITHDRAWN.				
		£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 50 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	£. 10 Leaseholders.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 50 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	£. 10 Leaseholders.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 50 Freeholders.	£. 50 Leaseholders.	£. 10 Freeholders.	£. 10 Leaseholders.
1836:																
Killarney, Hilary sess.	8	1	1	-	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Trillick, Hilary -	21	1	1	-	6	-	-	1	1	1	2	-	-	1	-	4
Killarney, Easter -	6	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	-	-	-	-	1
Trillick, Easter -	23	5	-	-	7	-	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	0	0
Killarney, Trinity -	7	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
Trillick, Trinity -	9	2	1	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1	-	4	2
Killarney, Mich. -	77	10	1	-	15	7	-	-	-	5	1	-	-	2	11	10
Trillick, Michaelmas -	94	3	21	-	8	1	1	1	-	2	-	-	2	3	2	13
1837:																
Killarney, Hilary -	41	-	1	-	4	4	-	-	1	-	7	4	-	-	12	3
Trillick, Hilary -	74	1	3	-	2	-	-	2	-	2	5	6	1	6	4	20

Note.—There were several notices of appeals given, but none of them were tried.

F. Cruise,
Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF KILDARE.

Sessions when Applications were made.	Number of Notices.	Admitted.	Rejected.	Withdrawn.	Appeals.
At the first or special sessions for the registration of voters, held under the Reform Act, commencing the 10th of October 1832, and continued by adjournment until the 12th of November following, at the several places throughout said county appointed by the Lord Lieutenant's precept for that purpose	1,860	1,111	17	732	
At the quarter sessions at					None.
Athy - - - - - 3 Jan. 1833	3	-	-	3	
Kildare - - - - - 2 April -	4	3	-	1	
Nass - - - - - 8 - - -	7	-	-	7	
Athy - - - - - 24 June -	2	1	-	1	
Maynooth - - - - - 1 July -	2	1	1	-	
Nass - - - - - 28 Oct. -	3	-	-	3	
Kildare - - - - - 2 April 1834	3	2	-	1	
Nass - - - - - 7 - - -	1	1	-	-	
Athy - - - - - 25 June -	3	1	2	-	
Maynooth - - - - - 30 - - -	1	1	-	-	
Kildare - - - - - 10 Oct. -	6	2	-	4	
Nass - - - - - 13 - - -	2	-	-	2	
Athy - - - - - 1 Jan. 1835	9	7	-	2	
Maynooth - - - - - 6 - - -	7	5	-	2	
Kildare - - - - - 2 April -	24	6	-	18	
Nass - - - - - 6 - - -	40	15	9	16	
Athy - - - - - 26 June -	3	1	-	2	
Maynooth - - - - - 30 - - -	41	22	4	15	
Kildare - - - - - 15 Oct. -	3	2	1	-	
Nass - - - - - 21 - - -	4	2	-	2	
Athy - - - - - 31 Dec. -	70	21	12	37	
Maynooth - - - - - 5 Jan. 1836	28	12	1	15	
Kildare - - - - - 7 April -	20	27	3	60	
Nass - - - - - 11 - - -	22	20	10	19	
Athy - - - - - 22 June -	31	9	-	22	
Maynooth - - - - - 27 - - -	17	5	-	12	
Kildare - - - - - 12 Oct. -	133	27	20	86	
Nass - - - - - 17 - - -	157	30	22	105	
Athy - - - - - 28 Dec. -	28	1	-	26	
Maynooth - - - - - 2 Jan. 1837	35	1	-	34	

George Medlicott,
Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF KILKENNY.

Number of Notices.	Claimants Admitted.	Rejected.	Withdrawn.	Did not Appear.	Registering Sessions.
3966	1,272	341*	-	9,353	October sessions 1832.
3	3	-	-	-	January sessions 1833.
1	1	-	-	-	Summer sessions 1833.
2	2	-	-	-	October sessions 1833.
4	4	-	-	-	Hilary sessions 1834.
6	9	-	-	-	October sessions 1834.
11	5	-	-	4	Hilary sessions 1835.
416	133	32	-	351	Easter sessions 1835.
76	34	12	-	30	Summer sessions 1835.
41	16	3	-	22	October sessions 1835.
18	11	1	-	6	Hilary sessions 1836.
14	8	3†	-	3	Easter sessions 1836.
18	3	2	-	13	Summer sessions 1836.
734	226	61‡	1	446	October sessions 1836.
310	72	19	-	219	Hilary sessions 1837.
5620	1,772	474	1	3,353	

Appendix (E.)

Notices of Applications to Register Voters.

* One of these was rejected by the registering barrister, for "insufficiency of value." He appealed, and was allowed to register by the Judge of assize.

† One of these, a 50l. freeholder, sworn before a Judge, was rejected by the assistant barrister, on the ground of "no proof being made before him that he was six months in possession." He appealed, and his vote allowed by the Judge of assize.

‡ There are four appeals lodged, but no assize since the sessions. They are still undisposed of.

John Flood, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF THE CITY OF KILKENNY.

1832, October -	Number of claimants to register who were admitted - - - - -	562	
	ditto - - - - - rejected - - - - -	19	
	Of these 19, six freemen appealed from the decision of the registering barrister, who rejected them on the ground of not having been sworn as freemen in sufficient time previous to the passing of the Reform Act, which decision was reversed by the next going Judge of assize.		
	Number withdrawn - - - - -	2	
	Ditto not appearing to claim - - - - -	304	
	Total number of notices of application - - - - -	867	
- December -	Number of notices of application - - - - -	2	
	ditto by affidavit of a 50l. freehold, sworn before a Judge Admitted - - - - -	1	
1833, April -	Number of claimants admitted - - - - -	5	3
	1 double notice served - - - - -	1	
	Total number of notices of application - - - - -	6	
- June -	Number of claimants admitted - - - - -	4	
	ditto not appearing - - - - -	1	
	Total number of notices of application - - - - -	5	
- October -	Number of claimants admitted - - - - -	7	
	Ditto on affidavit of a 50l. freehold, sworn before a Judge - - - - -	1	
	Ditto not appearing - - - - -	3	
	Total number of applications - - - - -	11	
- December -	Number of notices of application and admitted - - - - -	1	
1834, April -	Number of claimants admitted - - - - -	5	
	Rejected - - - - -	1	
	Not appearing - - - - -	2	
	1 double notice served - - - - -	1	
	Total number of notices of application - - - - -	9	
- June -	Number of notices of application and admitted - - - - -	3	
- December -	Number of claimants admitted - - - - -	2	
	Ditto rejected - - - - -	2	
	Ditto not appearing - - - - -	1	
	Total number of notices of application - - - - -	5	
1835, March	Number of claimants admitted - - - - -	67	
	Ditto rejected - - - - -	5	
	Ditto not appearing - - - - -	60	
	Total number of notices of application - - - - -	138	

(continued)

Appendix (B.)
Notices of Applications to Registrar
Vocars.

1835, June	Number of claimants admitted	-	-	-	-	13	
	Ditto rejected	-	-	-	-	1	
	One double notice	-	-	-	-	1	
	Total number of notices of application	-	-	-	-		15
— October	Number of claimants admitted	-	-	-	-	7	
	Ditto rejected	-	-	-	-	1	
	Ditto not appearing	-	-	-	-	2	
	Total number of notices of application	-	-	-	-		10
1836, January	Number of claimants admitted	-	-	-	-	5	
	Ditto on affidavit of a 50 l. freehold, sworn before a Judge	-	-	-	-	1	
	One of the above first served two notices, in other rights besides the one on which he was registered	-	-	-	-	2	
	Total number of applications	-	-	-	-		8
— March	Number of claimants admitted	-	-	-	-	4	
	Ditto on affidavit of a 50 l. freehold, sworn before a Judge	-	-	-	-	1	
	Ditto not appearing	-	-	-	-	3	
	Total number of applications	-	-	-	-		8
— June	Number of claimants admitted	-	-	-	-	48	
	Ditto rejected	-	-	-	-	4	
	Ditto not appearing	-	-	-	-	18	
	Total number of applications	-	-	-	-		70
— October	Number of claimants admitted	-	-	-	-	61	
	Ditto rejected	-	-	-	-	9	
	Ditto not appearing	-	-	-	-	41	
	Total number of applications	-	-	-	-		111
— December	Number of claimants admitted	-	-	-	-	11	
	Ditto on affidavit of a 50 l. freehold, sworn before a Judge	-	-	-	-	1	
	Ditto rejected	-	-	-	-	1	
	Ditto not appearing	-	-	-	-	39	
	Total number of applications	-	-	-	-		53

28 February 1837.

Patrick Walters, Clerk of the Peace.

KING'S COUNTY.

The number of notices served at the first or general registry sessions, held under the 2 & 3 Will. 4, c. 88, and which said sessions commenced on the 10th October 1830, and continued till the 17th November 1837, was 2,570. Number of claimants admitted at said sessions, 1,318. I have no means of giving the number of those rejected or withdrawn; but if reference is made to Thomas Cosgrave, Esq., who was registering barrister, it is probable he can furnish it. There was no appeal.

			Notices.	Admitted,	
Philpstown sessions	3 January	1833	110	34	No appeal.
Birr sessions	8 January	—	254	89	—
Philpstown sessions	19 March	—	68	14	—
Birr sessions	4 April	—	51	3	—
Philpstown sessions	31 June	—	0	3	—
Birr sessions	27 June	—	24	13	—
Philpstown sessions	16 October	—	—	3	—
Birr sessions	22 October	—	—	8	—
Philpstown sessions	27 October	—	—	—	—
Birr sessions	2 January	1834	—	6	—
Philpstown sessions	25 March	—	—	1	—
Birr sessions	1 April	—	—	2	—
Philpstown sessions	17 June	—	—	1	—
Birr sessions	23 June	—	—	7	—
Philpstown sessions	22 October	—	—	4	—
Birr sessions	28 October	—	—	19	—
Philpstown sessions	27 December	—	—	4	—
Birr sessions	2 January	1835	—	17	—
Philpstown sessions	27 March	—	168	37	—
Birr sessions	2 April	—	31	15	—
Philpstown sessions	23 June	—	16	8	—
Birr sessions	29 June	—	71	22	—
Philpstown sessions	31 October	—	30	2	—
Birr sessions	27 October	—	—	22	—
Philpstown sessions	29 December	—	19	8	—
Birr sessions	4 January	1836	77	39	—
Philpstown sessions	28 March	—	19	3	—
Birr sessions	9 April	—	111	3	—
Philpstown sessions	23 June	—	31	51	—
Birr sessions	29 June	—	11	4	—
Philpstown sessions	19 October	—	79	18	—
Birr sessions	25 October	—	91	37	—
Birr sessions	2 January	1837	102	47	—
			58	28	—

There were two appeals for insufficiency of value, but the claimants did not come forward at the notices.

There are some sessions I cannot give the number of notices, not having the lists; as, not being records, I did not keep them. There is no county of a city or borough in this county.

Robert Hastings, Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF LEITRIM.

DATES of SESSIONS.	Number of Voters sworn.			Number of Electors admitted.			Number of Electors rejected.			Number of Electors withdrawn.			Number of those of the Age and of the Qualification of Electors who were sworn.	Grounds of Appeal.	Judg- ment thereon.	Observations.
	£. 20.	£. 10.	£. 5.	£. 20.	£. 10.	£. 5.	£. 20.	£. 10.	£. 5.	£. 20.	£. 10.	£. 5.				
10, 13, 17, and 31 Oct., and 5 & 9 Nov. 1832.	282	257	1,805	60	150	1,031	-	10	137	103	107	637	0	- Insuf- ficiency of value.	dis- missal allowed.	- this includes throughout sworn, ap- pealed to be held by Go- vernment un- der the Irish Ballot Act.
27 December 1832	4	5	107	1	-	10	-	-	3	3	5	94				
8 January 1833	3	5	172	-	2	12	-	-	14	3	3	146				
26 March - -	2	3	63	2	-	6	-	-	5	-	3	52				
9 April - -	3	3	75	3	2	15	-	1	5	2	-	53	1	same -	same.	
18 June - -	3	2	38	2	2	12	-	-	4	1	-	17				
15 - - -	4	1	28	3	-	9	-	-	1	1	1	18				
9 October - -	1	2	18	1	-	5	-	-	5	-	2	8				
16 - - -	2	2	7	1	-	2	-	-	-	1	2	5				
31 December - -	1	1	15	-	-	3	-	-	-	1	1	12				
7 January 1834	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1				
28 March - -	-	2	11	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	11				
1 April - -	5	2	9	2	-	-	-	-	1	2	2	8				
17 June - -	-	-	5	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	4				
14 - - -	1	3	5	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	1	4				
9 October - -	-	1	33	-	-	15	-	-	3	-	1	15				
13 - - -	2	7	9	1	1	-	-	-	4	1	6	5				
30 December - -	-	-	12	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	11				
6 January 1835	2	2	27	2	-	1	-	-	5	-	2	21				
21 March - -	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1				
7 April - -	2	3	10	2	3	14	-	-	2	-	-	3	1	same -	same.	
13 June - -	4	2	3	4	2	2	-	-	-	-	-	1				
30 - - -	4	-	8	4	-	5	-	-	1	-	-	5				
13 October - -	4	-	2	1	-	-	1	-	1	2	-	1				
20 - - -	5	2	43	3	2	15	-	-	2	7	28					
19 December - -	2	3	27	2	1	8	-	-	10	-	2	9				
5 January 1836	7	11	67	2	1	23	1	-	13	4	10	31				
30 March - -	1	2	42	1	-	8	-	-	3	-	2	31				
6 April - -	10	14	94	5	-	23	-	-	15	5	14	67	2	same -	same.	
25 June - -	-	3	21	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3	21				
29 - - -	4	8	30	1	-	8	-	-	5	2	8	17				
13 October - -	-	4	45	-	1	15	-	-	7	-	3	23				
20 - - -	3	2	175	1	-	48	-	-	26	4	9	100	4	same -	- two cham- ber dis- allowed.	- two others did not ap- pear.
18 December - -	2	3	56	-	2	5	-	-	4	2	1	47				
TOTAL - - -	354	371	3,112	102	172	1,268	2	11	274	161	198	1,553				

N. B.—In the column of withdrawn notices are enumerated all those applicants who did not appear when severally called.

Peace Office, Carrick-on-Shannon,
13 March 1837.

Alexander Smith,
Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF LIMERICK.

Appendix (E.)

Notices of Applications to Register Voters.

Number of Notices at each Session.	Number admitted.	Feeholders.	Leasholders.	Rentcharges.	Rejected or withdrawn.	Number of Decisions appealed against.
1st session - 559 ⁶	5,735	2,563	140	38	2,861	none.
2d ditto - 40	10	8	2	-	39	—
3d ditto - 61	99	22	6	1	32	—
4th ditto - 248	102	101	1	-	145	—
5th ditto - 199	48	44	3	1	151	—
6th ditto - 28	9	8	1	-	19	—
7th ditto - 85	34	27	5	2	51	—
8th ditto - 26	12	6	6	-	14	—
9th ditto - 48	24	24	-	-	24	—
10th ditto - 15	6	6	-	-	9	—
11th ditto - 124	40	36	3	1	98	—
12th ditto - 16	8	7	1	-	8	—
13th ditto - 26	12	12	-	-	14	—
14th ditto - 25	-	-	-	-	25	—
15th ditto - 18	6	6	-	-	12	—
16th ditto - 4	1	1	-	-	3	—
17th ditto - 470	180	126	43	1	226	—
18th ditto - 240	24	24	-	-	216	—

The greater number of the persons who serve notices do not attend.

County Limerick Peace Office,
25 February 1837.

Malton H. D'Coursey,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF THE CITY OF LIMERICK.

At what Registering Sessions.	Number of Notices served.	Admitted and registered.	Rejected or did not appear.	Decision of Barrister, and Appeals thereon.
At the general registry in 1832	4,270	2,257	2,013	The only appeals lodged to the decisions of the registering barristers since the passing of the Reform Act were two, to the last spring assizes 1837, when the appellants being called in court, did not appear to prosecute same.
January sessions - - - 1833	26	26	—	
April ditto - - - - -	104	34	70	
July ditto - - - - -	5	5	—	
October ditto - - - - -	83	38	45	
January ditto - - - - 1834	4	4	—	
April ditto - - - - -	—	—	—	
July ditto - - - - -	9	9	—	
October ditto - - - - -	12	12	—	
January ditto - - - - 1835	63	30	33	
April ditto - - - - -	512	153	365	
July ditto - - - - -	4	4	—	
October ditto - - - - -	254	68	186	
January ditto - - - - 1836	244	32	212	
April ditto - - - - -	554	164	390	
July ditto - - - - -	none.	—	—	
October ditto - - - - -	555	36	519	
January ditto - - - - 1837	239	21	218	

Edward Parker,
Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF ANTRIM—BOROUGH OF LISBURN.

Appendix (E.)

Notices of Applications to Register Voters.

Date of Registry.	Number of Notices.	Number admitted.	Number rejected.	Number withdrawn.	Number of Appeals.	Grounds of Appeal, and Judgment.
October - - 1832	118	98	3	93	- -	- - not any appeal.
April - - 1833	59	35	1	53	- -	
October - - 1834	43	10	- -	13	- -	
January - - 1835	98	1	- -	21	- -	
April - - -	19	10	- -	9	- -	
October - - -	13	6	- -	7	- -	
January - - 1836	9	3	- -	6	- -	
October - - -	2	- -	- -	2	- -	
TOTAL - -	495	157	4	104	- -	

20 March 1837.

S. Dawson,
Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF LONDONDERRY.

Dec.	Freeholders.	Householders.	Decisions of Registrar.	Grounds of Appeal.	Judgment thereon.
29 Nov. 1832.	1	- - -	- - for variance between notice and certificate.	no appeal.	
- -	1	- - -	- - for want of sufficient notice.	like.	
- -	1	- - -	for insufficiency of value	like.	
- -	1	- - -	like - - - -	like.	
- -	1	- - -	for insufficient notice -	like.	
- -	1	- - -	for improper notice -	like.	
- -	1	- - -	for insufficiency of notice	like.	
- -	1	- - -	like - - - -	like.	
- -	- - -	1	like - - - -	like.	
- -	1	- - -	for being a sub-tenant -	like.	
- -	1	- - -	for want of value -	like.	
- -	1	- - -	like - - - -	like.	
- -	- - -	1	for insufficiency of notice	like.	
- -	- - -	1	like - - - -	like.	
- -	- - -	1	for want of value -	like.	
- -	- - -	1	like - - - -	like.	
- -	1	- - -	for undue notice -	like.	
- -	1	- - -	- - - - -	like.	
- -	1	- - -	for insufficient notice -	like.	
- -	1	- - -	for want of value -	like.	
- -	1	- - -	for want of title -	like.	
29 Dec. 1834	1	- - -	rejected for want of value	like.	
- -	1	- - -	like - - - -	like.	
- -	1	- - -	like - - - -	like.	
- -	1	- - -	like - - - -	like.	

4 March 1837.

James Gregg, Clerk of the Peace.

CITY OF LONDONDERRY.

Date.	Foreman.	Householder.	Decision of Barrister.	Grounds of Appeal.	Judgment thereon.
15 October 1834	-	1	holding a joint tenancy.	no appeal.	
1 April 1835	-	1	not six months in possession.	like.	
—	—	1	non-residence for six months.	like.	
23 June 1835	1	-	- - having been admitted an honorary freeman on 7 October 1831.	like.	
14 October 1835	-	1	- - Not being in actual occupation of premises.	- appeal on ground of occupation.	- - judgment reversed, and claimant admitted.
—	—	1	not being a householder	- no appeal.	
—	—	1	- - for not being in actual occupation.	- appeal on ground of occupation.	- - judgment reversed, and claimant admitted.
—	—	1	like decision - - -	like - - -	- - judgment reversed, and claimant admitted.
—	—	-1	- - not being in actual occupation of premises.	no appeal.	
21 June 1836	-	1	for misnomer in notice	like.	
18 October 1836	-	1	like - - -	like.	
—	—	1	for insufficient notice - -	like.	
4 March 1837.					James Gregg, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF LONGFORD.

Date of Session.	Number of Notices served.	Number of Claims admitted.	Number of Claims rejected.	Number withdrawn, not appearing.	Number of Decisions appealed against.	Grounds of Appeal.	Judgment on Appeal.
10, 13, 17 and 23 October, and 15 November 1831.	3,087	1,525	316	1,456	103	- - on value, only one tried.	registered.
31 December 1831, and 2 January 1832.	955	40	109	163			
5 and 8 April 1832	306	56	41	209			
24 and 26 June 1833	95	19	3	73			
21 and 23 October 1833	96	20	1	15			
30 December 1833, and 1 January 1834.	17	2	-	15			
7 and 9 April 1834	27	18	-	9			
23 and 25 June 1834	7	6	-	1			
15 October 1834	11	6	-	5			
29 and 31 December 1834	11	2	1	8			
6th and 7th April 1835	516	104	64	358			
29 and 30 June 1835	972	137	8	251			
10 and 13 October 1835	26	11	2	13			
4 and 5 January 1836	131	5	10	116			
4 and 5 April 1836	266	21	23	221			
20 and 21 June 1836	57	11	17	29	4	- - these four cases were rejected, the leases produced appearing to have been executed by the claimants within the last three months.	registered.
17 and 18 October 1836	195	47	12	136	6	on value - -	not tried.
2 and 3 January 1837	258	56	30	142	3	same - -	same.

23 February 1837.

John F. Crawford, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF LOUTH.

Date of Registering Sessions.	Number of Applicants at each Session.	Number of Claims admitted.	Number of Claims rejected.	Number of Claims withdrawn.	Number of Decisions appealed against.	Number of Decisions affirmed.	Number of Decisions reversed.
10 October 1832, being the first session under Reform Act.	2,076	893	187	2	6	3	3
3 January 1833	79	9					
3 April	15	5					
25 June	23	3	1				
22 October	18	5	1				
1 January 1834	4	1					
2 April	14	3	1				
24 June	8	1					
14 October	11	3	1				
1 January 1835	86	27	9				
3 April	101	28	10				
23 June	21	4	2		1		1
20 October	39	7	3				
5 January 1836	64	12	3		1		1
6 April	141	6	8				
27 June	2	1					
12 October	80	1					
4 January 1837	38	5					
Total	2,820	584	205	2	8	3	5

I am unable to state the grounds of appeal; the grounds of rejection can be stated if required.

Thomas Barrow, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF MAYO.

N A M E, and Date of Sessions Term.	Number of Applicants.	Number admitted.	Number rejected.	Number withdrawn.	Number appealed against.	Grounds of Appeal.	Judgment on Appeal.
The County at large, under the Reform Act, commencing 10 October 1832, and ending in December 1832	2,077	1,313	200	1,413			
Clare - - - - - 26 March 1833							
Westport - - - - - 5 April	587	61	68	457	32		
Ballinrobe - - - - - 30 June	310	27	31	252	7		
Ballina - - - - - 1 July	102	23	6	74	3		
Clare - - - - - 9 Oct.	331	33	20	278	8		
Castlebar - - - - - 21 Oct.	213	68	20	115	6		
Ballinrobe - - - - - 28 Dec.	21	5	5	11	1		
Castlebar - - - - - 7 Jan. 1834	92	5	5	82	1		
Clare - - - - - 26 March	26	9	5	20			
Westport - - - - - 4 April	52	1	2	49			
Ballinrobe - - - - - 17 June	20	11	2	7			
Ballina - - - - - 25 June	21	7	7	8			
Clare - - - - - 9 Oct.							
Castlebar - - - - - 20 Oct.	5	2	2	1			
Ballinrobe - - - - - 20 Dec.	9	3	1	5			
Castlebar - - - - - 6 Jan. 1835	24	2	1	21			
Clare - - - - - 26 March	147	8	13	126	1		
Westport - - - - - 3 April	205	6	10	79	5		
Ballinrobe - - - - - 22 June	35	4	5	26			
Ballina - - - - - 30 June	112	6	13	93			
Clare - - - - - 9 Oct.	14	1	1	12			
Castlebar - - - - - 19 Oct.	12	4		8			
Ballinrobe - - - - - 28 Dec.	12	1	1	10			
Castlebar - - - - - 5 Jan. 1836	10	1		9			
Clare - - - - - 26 March	7	2	1	4			
Westport - - - - - 5 April	7	3		4			
Ballinrobe - - - - - 17 June	26	9	4	13			
Ballina - - - - - 25 June	69	12	16	41			
Clare - - - - - 10 Oct.	263	121	24	108			
Castlebar - - - - - 19 Oct.	25	20	5	50	1		
Ballinrobe - - - - - 27 Dec.	29	3	2	24			
Castlebar - - - - - 4 Jan. 1837	30	5	1	24			

Ballinrobe, 4 March 1837.

Thos. Gilmo, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF MEATH.

Appendix (E.)

Notices of Applications to Register Voters.

General Registry, commencing October 1832.	Number of Notices.	Number of Claimants admitted.	Number rejected.	Number not appearing when called.	Number appealed, Grounds of Appeal and Judgment.
General Registry, October 1832	4,378	1,530	180	2,708	
Hilary Sessions - 1833 - - -	100	14	5	81	
Easter Sessions - - - - -	80	20	8	52	
Summer Sessions - - - - -	78	14	1	63	
October Sessions - - - - -	134	23	8	103	
Hilary - ditto - 1834 - - -	91	8	1	82	
Easter - ditto - - - - -	68	6	-	62	
Summer, ditto - - - - -	47	1	-	46	
October, ditto - - - - -	30	4	-	26	
Hilary - ditto - 1835 - - -	50	14	4	32	
Easter - ditto - - - - -	190	29	7	144	
Summer, ditto - - - - -	244	18	15	211	
October, ditto - - - - -	250	38	10	210	
Hilary - ditto - 1836 - - -	349	50	17	282	
Easter - ditto - - - - -	377	28	5	344	
Summer, ditto - - - - -	148	12	3	132	
October, ditto - - - - -	255	46	14	195	
Hilary - ditto - 1837 - - -	280	33	6	241	- Two rejected for insufficiency of value, and afterwards allowed on appeal to the Judge of assize.

17 March 1837.

Robert Chambers, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF MONAGHAN.

Place, and Date of each Registering Session.	Number of Notices of application.	Number of Claimants admitted.	Number of Claimants rejected or withdrawn.	Number of Decisions appealed against.	Grounds of Appeal, and Judgment thereon.
Monaghan - October 1832	- This was the first registry under Reform Bill, commencing in October, but extending to Dec. 1832	164			
Castletown, October - - -		210			
Monaghan - October - - -		624			
Bane - - - November - - -		445	1,719		
Cionas - - - November - - -		50			
Castletown, November - - -		569			
Castletown, March 1833		97			
Monaghan - April - - -	189	87	102		
Castletown, June - - -	114	55	89		
Monaghan - June - - -	29	14	15		
Castletown, October - - -	73	40	33		
Monaghan - October - - -	47	2	45		
Castletown, December - - -	99	40	59		
Monaghan - January 1834	3	2	1		
Castletown, March - - -	75	35	40		
Monaghan - April - - -	96	11	85		
Castletown, June - - -	145	74	72		
Monaghan - June - - -	103	39	64		
Castletown, October - - -	200	49	151		
Monaghan - October - - -	316	27	289	none	none.
Castletown, December - - -	93	23	70		
Monaghan - January 1835	13	3	10		
Castletown, March - - -	82	27	41		
Monaghan - April - - -	82	3	79		
Castletown, June - - -	55	11	44		
Monaghan - June - - -	114	16	98		
Castletown, July - - -	25	22	13		
Monaghan - October - - -	1	1			
Castletown, December - - -	44	29	15		
Monaghan - January 1836	144	45	99		
Castletown, March - - -	112	60	52		
Monaghan - April - - -	314	37	277		
Castletown, June - - -	97	36	61		
Monaghan - June - - -	87	35	52		
Castletown, October - - -	116	73	43		
Monaghan - October - - -	90	25	65		
Castletown, December - - -	83	62	21		
Monaghan - January - - -	206	17	189		
Castletown, - - -	20	5	15		

B. Huid, Clerk of the Peace.

QUEEN'S COUNTY.

Number of Notices of Applications at each Registering Session.	Number of Claimants admitted.	Number of Claimants rejected.	Number of Claimants withdrawn.	Number referred to appeal.	Ground of appeal.	Judgment thereon.
3025. At first Special Registry Sessions under Irish Reform Act, commencing 18th October 1832 and ended 23d November 1832.	1,470	325	4,131			
26. 28 Dec. - 1832	6	9	50			
47. 2 January 1833	11	13	23			
196. 3 April - "	22	34	140	2	none stated -	Barrister's judgment affirmed.
265. 9 - - - -	48	20	183	2	ditto -	ditto.
70. 20 June - -	30	6	43	1	ditto -	ditto.
37. 24 - - - -	18	4	15			
88. 23 October -	21	5	62			
67. 29 - - - -	15	3	30			
75. 2 January 1834	11	4	60			
55. 7 - - - -	11	4	40			
13. 2 April - - -	5	-	8			
41. 8 - - - -	11	1	29			
20. 19 June - - -	7	1	12			
14. 24 - - - -	3	1	10			
21. 15 October - -	8	2	11			
48. 22 October - -	13	6	29			
120. 1 January 1835	3	5	122			
127. 6 - - - -	42	10	76	2	ditto -	1 barrister's decisions affirmed. 1 barrister's decisions reversed; allowed.
306. 31 March - - -	204	129	652	56	ditto -	51 barrister's decisions affirmed. 3 barrister's decisions reversed; allowed.
328. 7 April - - -	115	129	614	57	ditto -	55 barrister's decisions affirmed. 2 barrister's decisions reversed; allowed.
122. 15 June - - -	11	2	108	1	ditto -	barrister's decision affirmed.
113. 20 - - - -	24	7	82	1	ditto -	ditto.
32. 14 October - -	11	7	14			
16. 21 - - - -	7	4	84			
313. 31 December -	9	14	220	1	ditto -	barrister's decision reversed; allowed.
547. 5 January 1836	25	14	208	1	ditto -	barrister's decision reversed; allowed.
100. 5 April - - -	6	1	53			
270. 13 - - - -	10	5	257	3	ditto -	barrister's decisions affirmed.
60. 17 June - - -	8	1	51	1	ditto -	ditto.
19. 23 - - - -	9	1	9	1	ditto -	barrister's decision reversed; allowed.
189. 19 October - -	36	21	132	4	ditto -	for trial at next assizes.
225. 27 - - - -	30	27	168	10	ditto -	ditto.
255. 4 January 1837	36	17	202	11	ditto -	ditto.
222. 10 - - - -	77	26	119	14	ditto -	ditto.

WILLIAM COLLIER, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF ROSCOMMON.

Season.	Number of notices of application to register.	Number admitted.					Number rejected.	Number withdrawn.	Number appealed against.	Grounds of Appeal, and judgment thereon.
		£. 50 Free-holders.	£. 40 Lease-holders.	£. 30 Free-holders.	£. 20 Lease-holders.	£. 10 Free-holders.				
October - 1833	4,351	330	8	177	78	1,408	73	2,484	45	-- did not appear to prosecute appeal.
31 Dec. - "	1	1								
4 Jan. - 1833	15					8	4	3		
26 March - "	1	1								
30 - "	21	2				0	5	5		
31 June - "	7	2				1		4		
25 - "	47	2		9		1		42		
12 Oct. - "	1						1			
18 - "	30	1		1		3	1	24		
4 Jan. - 1834	10					1		9		
26 March - "	7	2						5		
31 - "	65	1				7	3	53		
20 June - "	1					1				
25 - "	38	1				10	3	18		
21 Oct. - "	3	2						1		
27 - "	135	2		2	10	22		99		
30 Dec. - "	4	2						2		
5 Jan. - 1835	115		1		2	20		89		
20 March - "	20	7				4	2	7		
31 - "	105	10		4	1	9	5	75	2*	
23 June - "	21	3				5	6	7	1†	
27 - "	58	2		1		3	3	49		
31 Oct. - "	13	5		1		1		6		
27 - "	4					3		1		
22 Dec. - "	2					1		1		
26 March 1836	13	2				3		7		
1 April - "	17	4		1		2	1	9		
22 June - "	11			3			1	7		
28 - "	11	2		5		3		1		
20 Oct. - "	57	1				1	1	54		
27 - "	120	5		1	11	4	16	93		
28 Dec. - "	20	4		2		2	1	30		
3 Jan. - 1837	16	4		1				11		
TOTAL - -	5,200	308	9	201	95	1,238	125	3,199	45	

John Merwin, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF SLIGO.

Season and Year.	Number of Notices.	Withdrawn or do not attend.			Admitted.			Rejected.			Number appealed against, and grounds of Appeal.	Judgment thereon.
		F.	L.	R. C.	Free-holders.	Lease-holders.	Res-changes.	Free-holders.	Lease-holders.	Res-changes.		
October - 1830	1,340	533	57	15	679	5	18	30	3	1	none appealed against.	
Hilary - 1833	122	71	1		38			12			ditto.	
Easter - 1833	42	19	1		21			8			ditto.	
Summer - 1833	26	20	1		4			5			ditto.	
October - 1833	29	14			15			none.				
Hilary - 1834	21	7			12		2	none.				
Easter - 1834	17	6		1	5			4		1	ditto.	
Summer - 1834	18	14		1	none.			3			ditto.	
October - 1834	24	9	1	1	10	1	1	1			ditto.	
Hilary - 1835	21	11			2			1		1	ditto.	
Easter - 1835	15	5		1	6	1		2			ditto.	
Summer - 1835	8			2	6						ditto.	
October - 1835	11	1		2	6	1		1			ditto.	
Hilary - 1836	8	4	2		2			none.				
Easter - 1836	9	7			2			none.				
Summer - 1836	8	5			1			2			ditto.	
October - 1836	104	130	2	2	29	2	1	24	3	1	ditto.	
Hilary - 1837	62	402	15	3	119	1	1	145	4	1	-- there have been no notices of appeals served on the clerk of peace yet.	

R. W. JONES, Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF TIPPERARY.

Appendix (B.)

				Notices of Applications to Register Voters.
Number of Notices served for Special Sessions, 10 October 1832				
Of 50 l.	-	-	603 approved of.	8,756
Of 20 l.	-	-	332 ditto.	5,020
Of 10 l.	-	-	1,434 ditto.	2,845
			Rejected, and did not appeal	477
			Approved of	8,369
Number of Notices for Cashel General Quarter Sessions, 8 January 1833				
Of 50 l.	-	-	1 approved of.	60
Of 20 l.	-	-	3 ditto.	85
Of 10 l.	-	-	8 ditto.	13
			Rejected, and did not appeal	1
			Approved of	13
Number of Notices for Nenagh General Quarter Sessions, 15 January 1833				
			Did not appear	31
			Approved of	30
Of 50 l.	-	-	1 approved of, as opposite	1
Number of Notices for Clonmel General Quarter Sessions, 8 April 1833				
Of 50 l.	-	-	2 approved of.	9
Of 20 l.	-	-	1 ditto.	6
			Approved of	3
Number of Notices for Thurles General Quarter Sessions, 15 April 1833				
Of 50 l.	-	-	2 approved of.	66
Of 20 l.	-	-	1 ditto.	63
			Approved of	3
Number of Notices for Nenagh General Quarter Sessions, 24 June 1833				
Of 20 l.	-	-	1 approved of.	16
			Approved of	15
			Approved of	1
Number of Notices for Cashel General Quarter Sessions, 1 July 1833				
Of 20 l.	-	-	2 approved of.	10
			Approved of	8
Number of Notices for Thurles General Quarter Sessions, 21 October 1833				
Of 50 l.	-	-	1 approved of.	15
Of 20 l.	-	-	2 ditto.	17
Of 10 l.	-	-	5 ditto.	
			Approved of	8
Number of Notices for Clonmel General Quarter Sessions, 28 October 1833				
Of 50 l.	-	-	5 approved of.	57
Of 20 l.	-	-	6 ditto.	33
Of 10 l.	-	-	9 ditto.	4
			Rejected, and did not appeal	4
			Approved of	90
Number of Notices for Nenagh General Quarter Sessions, 30 December 1833				
Of 50 l.	-	-	3 approved of, as opposite	3
Number of Notices for Cashel General Quarter Sessions, 6 January 1834				
Of 20 l.	-	-	2 approved of.	8
Of 10 l.	-	-	1 ditto.	5
			Approved of	3
Number of Notices for Thurles General Quarter Sessions, 31 March 1834				
			Did not appear	2

Appendix (E)		Number of Notices for Clonmel General Quarter Sessions, 7 April 1834		-		-		-		6	
Notices of Applications to Register Voters.		Of 10 l.		- 1 approved of.		-		-		4	
						Rejected, and did not appeal		-		2	
				1 as opposite		-		-		1	
						Approved of		-		1	
										3	
										2	
				5 as opposite		-		-		5	
										10	
										4	
										6	
				5 as opposite		-		-		5	
										7	
										4	
				3 as opposite		-		-		3	
										9	
										5	
				4 as opposite		-		-		4	
										15	
										3	
				12 as opposite		-		-		12	
										9	
										4	
				5 as opposite		-		-		5	
										102	
										78	
										54	
				16 as opposite		-		-		16	
										63	
										46	
				17 as opposite		-		-		17	
										368	
										208	
										140	
				93 as opposite		-		-		93	
										79	
										73	
				6 as opposite		-		-		6	

Number of Notices for Thurles General Quarter Sessions, 19 October 1835		-	-	-	435
Of 50 l.	-	12	approved of.	Did not appear	-
Of 20 l.	-	5	ditto.		206
Of 10 l.	-	74	ditto.		120
				Rejected and did not appeal	38
	91	as opposite	-	-	91
Number of Notices served for Clonmel General Quarter Sessions, 28 October 1835		-	-	-	430
Of 50 l.	-	14	approved of.	Did not appear	-
Of 20 l.	-	15	ditto.		292
Of 10 l.	-	77	ditto.		138
				Rejected and did not appeal	34
	104	as opposite	-	-	104
Notices for Nenagh General Quarter Sessions, 29 December 1835		-	-	-	All served too late.
Notices served for Cashel General Quarter Sessions, 11 January 1836		-	-	-	409
Of 50 l.	-	10	approved of.	Did not appear	-
Of 20 l.	-	3	ditto.		262
Of 10 l.	-	29	ditto.		47
				Rejected and did not appeal	15
	39	as opposite	-	-	39
Notices served for Thurles General Quarter Sessions, 29 March 1836		-	-	-	565
Of 50 l.	-	2	approved.	Did not appear	-
Of 20 l.	-	3	ditto.		514
Of 10 l.	-	6	ditto.		51
				Rejected and did not appeal	10
	11	as opposite	-	-	11
Notices served for Clonmel General Quarter Sessions, 11 April 1836		-	-	-	510
Of 50 l.	-	11	approved of.	Did not appear	-
Of 20 l.	-	7	ditto.		377
Of 10 l.	-	4	ditto.		33
				Rejected and did not appeal	11
	22	as opposite	-	-	22
Notices served for Cashel General Quarter Sessions, 21 June 1836		-	-	-	20
Of 50 l.	-	3	approved of.	Did not appear	-
Of 10 l.	-	1	ditto.		16
	4	as opposite	-	-	4
Notices served for Nenagh General Quarter Sessions, 1 July 1836		-	-	-	150
Of 50 l.	-	6	approved of.	Did not appear	-
Of 20 l.	-	7	ditto.		96
Of 10 l.	-	10	ditto.		54
				Rejected and did not appeal	31
	23	as opposite	-	-	23
Notices served for Thurles General Quarter Sessions, 18 October 1836		-	-	-	355
Of 50 l.	-	7	approved of.	Did not appear	-
Of 20 l.	-	3	ditto.		236
Of 10 l.	-	73	ditto.		99
				Rejected and did not appeal	16
	83	as opposite	-	-	83
Notices served for Clonmel General Quarter Sessions, 1 November 1836		-	-	-	350
Of 50 l.	-	3	approved of.	Did not appear	-
Of 20 l.	-	10	ditto.		203
Of 10 l.	-	13	ditto.		47
				Rejected and did not appeal	21
	26	as opposite	-	-	26
Notices served for Cashel General Quarter Sessions, 29 December 1836		-	-	-	89
Of 50 l.	-	8	approved of.	Did not appear	-
Of 20 l.	-	2	ditto.		51
Of 10 l.	-	2	ditto.		18
				Rejected and did not appeal	6
	12	as opposite	-	-	12

3 April 1837.

J. Garlin,
Clerk of the Peace.Appendix (E.)
Notices of Applications to Register Voters.

COUNTY OF WATERFORD

REGISTERING SESSIONS.	Number of Notices served.								Number admitted.		
	Freeholders.			Leaseholders.			Rentcharges.		Freeholders.		
	£. 50.	£. 20.	£. 10.	£. 50.	£. 20.	£. 10.	£. 50.	£. 20.	£. 50.	£. 20.	£. 10.
General special sessions under the Reform Act, 10th October 1832, and following days, to 9th November 1832	339	167	1,064	-	70	660	15	48	296	162	807
Waterford general sessions, 4 January 1833	1	2	4	-	2	-	1	1	1	1	-
Waterford ditto, 29 March 1833	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Lismore ditto, 1 April 1833	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-
Waterford ditto, 21 June 1833	-	1	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	1	-
Dungarvan ditto, 24 June 1833	-	1	7	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	-
Waterford ditto, 11 October 1833	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Dungarvan ditto, 14 October 1833	3	2	5	-	-	1	1	-	3	1	5
Waterford ditto, 3 January 1834	-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-
Dungarvan ditto, 6 January 1834	2	1	2	-	-	1	1	-	2	-	-
Waterford ditto, 4 April 1834	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Lismore ditto, 7 April 1834	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-
Waterford ditto, 20 June 1834	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Dungarvan ditto, 23 June 1834	-	1	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	1	-
Waterford ditto, 10 October 1834	2	1	2	-	-	11	1	1	-	1	-
Lismore ditto, 13 October 1834	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Waterford ditto, 2 January 1835	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
Dungarvan ditto, 5 January 1835	3	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-
Waterford ditto, 3 April 1835	2	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	1	-	-
Lismore ditto, 6 April 1835	3	2	-	-	-	-	-	1	3	1	-
Waterford ditto, 26 June 1835	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Dungarvan ditto, 29 June 1835	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Waterford ditto, 9 October 1835	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Lismore ditto, 12 October 1835	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Waterford ditto, 1 January 1836	1	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-
Dungarvan ditto, 4 January 1836	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Waterford ditto, 4 April 1836	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-
Lismore ditto, 8 April 1836	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-
Waterford ditto, 21 June 1836	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-
Dungarvan ditto, 27 June 1836	-	-	57	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	46
Waterford ditto, 19 October 1836	-	-	29	-	1	4	1	-	-	-	-
Lismore ditto, 24 October 1836	1	1	40	-	-	34	-	-	1	1	2
Waterford ditto, 29 December 1836	-	1	31	-	1	3	-	1	-	-	-
Dungarvan ditto, 1 January 1837	-	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-

Number of notices served - -	Freeholders of 50 l. and upwards	-	-	-	-	357
	50 l.	-	-	-	-	217
	10 l.	-	-	-	-	2,154
						2,728
Leaseholders of 20 l. and upwards	20 l. and upwards	-	-	-	-	80
	10 l.	-	-	-	-	724
						804
Rentcharges of 50 l. and upwards	50 l. and upwards	-	-	-	-	25
	20 l.	-	-	-	-	55
						80
Numbers admitted - - -	Freeholders of 50 l. and upwards	-	-	-	-	256
	20 l.	-	-	-	-	171
	10 l.	-	-	-	-	526
						1,253
Leaseholders of 20 l. and upwards	20 l. and upwards	-	-	-	-	13
	10 l.	-	-	-	-	140
						153
Rentcharges of 50 l. and upwards	50 l. and upwards	-	-	-	-	26
	20 l.	-	-	-	-	30
						56

Waterford, 14 March 1837.

COUNTY OF WESTMEATH.

Appendix (E.)

Notices of Applications to Register Voters.	Number of Names served.	Number admitted.	Number rejected.	Number withdrawn.	Date of Registry.	Number of Appeals, Grounds of Appeal and Judgment.
4,068	1,398	311	2,459	- -	First general registry sessions, held under the Act of 2 & 3 Will. 4, c. 88.	- - There have not been any appeals lodged against any order of rejection made by the registering or assistant barrister.
87	22	5	60	- -	Hilary sessions - 1833.	
68	26	1	41	- -	Easter Sessions - - -	
55	27	2	26	- -	Summer sessions - - -	
57	16	5	36	- -	Michaelmas sessions - - -	
33	20	2	11	- -	Hilary sessions - 1834.	
35	18	3	14	- -	Easter sessions - - -	
30	12	3	5	- -	Summer sessions - - -	
7	-	3	4	- -	Michaelmas sessions - - -	
10	7	-	3	- -	Hilary sessions - 1835.	
18	12	1	5	- -	Easter sessions - - -	
17	6	7	4	- -	Midsummer sessions - - -	
11	9	-	2	- -	Michaelmas sessions - - -	
1	1	-	-	- -	Hilary sessions - 1836.	
12	2	2	7	- -	Easter sessions - - -	
4	2	-	2	- -	Summer sessions - - -	
126	65	9	61	- -	Michaelmas sessions - - -	
23	7	1	15	- -	Hilary sessions - 1837.	

25 March 1837.

G. Fetherston H.,
Clerk of the Peace.

COUNTY OF WICKLOW.

Date of each Registering Session.	Number of Notices of Applications at each Session.	Number of Claims admitted.	Number of Claims rejected.	Number withdrawn, or who did not appear.	Number of Decisions appealed against.	Grounds of Appeal or Cause of Rejection.	Judgment on Appeal.
First general registry sessions commenced 10th Oct. 1830.	3,666	1,545	-	-	none.		
Hilary quarter sessions 1833	-	20	-	-	-		
Easter - ditto - - -	-	49	-	-	-		
Summer - ditto - - -	-	2	-	-	-		
Michaelmas ditto - - -	-	10	-	-	-		
Hilary - ditto - 1834	-	0	-	-	-		
Easter - ditto - - -	-	6	-	-	-		
Summer - ditto - - -	26	6	3	17	none.		
Michaelmas ditto - - -	59	5	1	46	none.		
Hilary - ditto - 1835	29	8	6	15	none.		
Easter - ditto - - -	107	23	16	68	1	Want of title -	Barrister's decision affirmed.
Summer - ditto - - -	133	10	1	122	none.		
Michaelmas ditto - - -	93	31	8	54	1	Informal notice	Affirmed.
Hilary - ditto - 1836	449	70	63	316	30	6, want of value; 23, want of title; 1, notice informal.	29 affirmed; 1 reversed.
Easter - ditto - - -	124	31	21	132	13	10, want of value; 2, want of title.	11 do.; 1 do.
Summer - ditto - - -	87	16	4	67	none.		
Michaelmas ditto - - -	173	29	18	126	6	3, want of value; 3, title.	All affirmed.
Hilary - ditto - 1837	126	21	20	85	4	Want of value	Ditto.

Observations.—There was no correct record kept by the Clerk of the Peace of the number of notices, number of rejections and causes of rejections, until Summer Sessions 1834, from which period this Return is correct.

1 April 1837.

Samuel Foster,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

Appendix (F.)

A RETURN OF THE NUMBER AND NAMES OF PERSONS Registered as Voters, in the City of Dublin, since the passing of the Reform Act for Ireland, with the Date of the Registry of each Voter, and the Date of the first day of the Registry Sessions at which each Freeman was Registered; and also a Return of the Date of the Notice for Registry of each such Registered Voter.

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Sessions.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Sessions.	Date of Notice of Registry.
1839:					1839—continued.				
1	Andrews, George	—	—	—	65	Allen, George	6 Nov.	—	—
2	Antle, John	—	—	—	66	Archer, Thomas	7 Nov.	—	—
3	Armstrong, John	—	—	—	67	Armstrong, William	—	—	—
4	Andrews, William	—	—	—	68	Arundel, Robert	9 Nov.	—	—
5	Abbot, John	—	—	—	69	Andrews, William	15 Nov.	—	—
6	Abbot, William	—	—	—	70	Armstrong, John	—	—	—
7	Armstrong, John	—	—	—	71	Ashley, Joseph	16 Nov.	—	—
8	Auchincloss, William	—	—	—	72	Arthur, Benedict	16 Nov.	—	—
9	Andrews, James	—	—	—	73	Billing, William	15 Oct.	—	—
10	Armstrong, Thomas	—	—	—	74	Harvey, Paul	—	—	—
11	Aisop, John	—	—	—	75	Baile, John Judkin	—	—	—
12	Ashby, William	—	—	—	76	Boothe, James	—	—	—
13	Abbott, Benjamin	—	—	—	77	Bentley, George	—	—	—
14	Adams, Joseph	—	—	—	78	Belton, Robert	—	—	—
15	Abbott, Edward Singleton	—	—	—	79	Benn, Rev. William	—	—	—
16	Abbott, Thomas	—	—	—	80	Brown, Benjamin	—	—	—
17	Andrews, William	—	—	—	81	Briery, Henry	—	—	—
18	Armstrong, Robert	15 Oct.	—	—	82	Burroughs, William	—	—	—
19	Asme, Richard	16 Oct.	—	—	83	Bass, James	—	—	—
20	Andrews, John	—	—	—	84	Baxenden, John	—	—	—
21	Allen, William	17 Oct.	—	—	85	Berk, Robert	16 Oct.	—	—
22	Armstrong, John	—	—	—	86	Bearns, Walter	—	—	—
23	Asnes, William	—	—	—	87	Berry, Edward	—	—	—
24	Andrews, John	18 Oct.	—	—	88	Bessett, John	—	—	—
25	Andrews, William	—	—	—	89	Blackwood, Hon. Hans	—	—	—
26	Adams, Arthur Smith	19 Oct.	—	—	90	Boss, John	—	—	—
27	Allovey, John	20 Oct.	—	—	91	Baldwin, James	—	—	—
28	Armstrong, Francis	20 Oct.	—	—	92	Beggs, Rev. Charles	—	—	—
29	Armstrong, George	—	—	—	93	Bowens, John	—	—	—
30	Atkinson, Richard	24 Oct.	—	—	94	Boss, Abel	—	—	—
31	Arnot, John	—	—	—	95	Burton, Peter	—	—	—
32	Armstrong, Joseph	25 Oct.	10 Oct.	29 Sept.	96	Budgett, George, jun.	—	10 Oct.	29 Sept.
33	Ascherburn, John Talbot	26 Oct.	—	—	97	Burley, John	—	—	—
34	Atkinson, Richard	27 Oct.	—	—	98	Blackburn, Henry	—	—	—
35	Abbot, William	—	—	—	99	Boss, Thomas	—	—	—
36	Allen, John	29 Oct.	—	—	100	Boyle, Skelthorpe	—	—	—
37	Arnold, Samuel	—	—	—	101	Borsford, John Chudmas	—	—	—
38	Aikin, Walter	—	—	—	102	Boss, Henry	—	—	—
39	Allen, Thomas	—	—	—	103	Burrows, Andrew	—	—	—
40	Adams, James	30 Oct.	—	—	104	Brown, Francis	—	—	—
41	Abbott, Philip	—	—	—	105	Branker, George	—	—	—
42	Abbott, Samuel	31 Oct.	—	—	106	Bowens, John	—	—	—
43	Allen, John	—	—	—	107	Baker, Henry Aaron	—	—	—
44	Alley, Testmann	—	—	—	108	Bowling, William	—	—	—
45	Armstrong, James	1 Nov.	—	—	109	Boss, Humphrey	—	—	—
46	Allen, Richard	—	—	—	110	Boss, Charles	—	—	—
47	Atkinson, Luke	—	—	—	111	Burton, Frederick	27 Oct.	—	—
48	Atkinson, Samuel	2 Nov.	—	—	112	Bellon, Robert	—	—	—
49	Alford, John	—	—	—	113	Byrne, Francis	—	—	—
50	Andrews, William	—	—	—	114	Baker, Henry Peile	—	—	—
51	Allen, Timothy	—	—	—	115	Baker, John Judkin, jun.	—	—	—
52	Alley, Peter	—	—	—	116	Brown, George	—	—	—
53	Alley, Thomas	—	—	—	117	Bowens, John	—	—	—
54	Armstrong, Edward	—	—	—	118	Byrne, Thomas	—	—	—
55	Anderson, Philip	—	—	—	119	Byrne, George	—	—	—
56	Archer, George	3 Nov.	—	—	120	Bridges, William Henry	—	—	—
57	Alexec, John	—	—	—	121	Bridg, Sir N. W., knight	—	—	—
58	Adams, William	—	—	—	122	Bowles, Henry	—	—	—
59	Adams, Robert	—	—	—	123	Barn, Henry	—	—	—
60	Alexec, Richard	—	—	—	124	Bourne, James	—	—	—
61	Alley, John	5 Nov.	—	—	125	Bourne, Frederick	—	—	—
62	Allison, Edward	—	—	—	126	Bourne, Joseph	—	—	—
63	Atkinson, Reed	—	—	—	127	Bourne, William	—	—	—
64	Archer, Rt. Hon. C. Palmer	6 Nov.	—	—	128	Burgher, George	—	—	—

(continued)

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.
	1830--continued.					1832--continued.			
120	Bailey, Thomas	17 Oct.			213	Brown, William	20 Oct.		
121	Bain, George	---			214	Brown, Thomas William	---		
121	Baker, George Dekar	---			215	Bull, Benjamin	28 Oct.		
122	Baker, James Giffney	---			216	Bullen, Simon	---		
123	Bald, Thomas	---			217	Bundy, John	---		
124	Baldham, William	---			218	Bowen, Richard	---		
125	Baldwin, Sir William	---			219	Bowen, George	---		
126	Barnington, Rev. J. Aldrich	---			220	Boyer, Robert	20 Oct.		
127	Bolger, Charles	---			221	Boyer, Robert	---		
128	Bolton, Isaac	---			222	Bowett, John	---		
129	Borah, Peter	---			223	Bury, Edward	---		
130	Boswell, George	---			224	Buckley, Jonathan	---		
131	Boger, Charles	---			225	Burdley, Robert	---		
132	Bondley, Julian	---			226	Burke, Geo. Harrison	24 Oct.		
133	Bonsall, Henry William	---			227	Burton, George	---		
134	Bore, George, jun.	---			228	Burton, Francis	15 Oct.		
135	Bowler, Thomas	---			229	Burton, John	26 Oct.		
136	Boss, Timothy	---			230	Burton, Richard	---		
137	Bosch, William Rogers	---			231	Burton, Joseph	---		
138	Botter, James	---			232	Brown, Joseph	27 Oct.		
139	Botter, Robert	---			233	Burton, Nelson	29 Oct.		
140	Bourne, John William	---			234	Bowen, Joseph	---		
141	Boucher, Messrs	---			235	Bruce, Charles	---		
142	Boucher, William	---			236	Buchler, Dan. M'Namara	20 Oct.		
143	Boke, John	---			237	Brown, William	---		
144	Boke, John	---			238	Brown, John	---		
145	Boyd, John	---			239	Brown, Benjamin Shafston	---		
146	Boyd, John	---			240	Bry, William	---		
147	Boyd, Arthur	---			241	Bryce, Thomas	31 Oct.		
148	Burwell, Thomas	---			242	Bull, Robert	1 Nov.		
149	Burns, John	---			243	Burns, Anthony	---		
150	Burke, Joseph	---			244	Burns, Michael	---		
151	Burke, James	---			245	Bull, John	---		
152	Bull, Robert	---			246	Burdley, William James	2 Nov.		
153	Bull, Arthur	---			247	Burton, William L.	3 Nov.		
154	Bull, William	---			248	Burton, John Anselm	---		
155	Bullock, John	---			249	Burton, George	---		
156	Bullington, Thomas	---			250	Burton, Samuel	---		
157	Burton, Samuel	---			251	Burton, Samuel	5 Nov.		
158	Burton, Erika	---			252	Bull, Edward	---		
159	Burton, Thomas	---			253	Bull, James	---		
160	Burton, Richard	---			254	Burton, Thomas	---		
161	Burton, John	---	10 Oct.	19 Sept.	255	Burdley, Samuel	10 Oct.	19 Sept.	
162	Burton, John	---			256	Burn, Edward	---		
163	Burton, John	---			257	Burton, Thomas	6 Nov.		
164	Burton, John	---			258	Burton, Joseph	---		
165	Burton, Thomas Edward	---			259	Burton, Lancel	---		
166	Burt, Thomas	---			260	Burke, James	7 Nov.		
167	Burton, Denis	---			261	Burke, John	---		
168	Burt, George	---			262	Burke, Edward	---		
169	Bull, Peter	---			263	Burdley, Joseph	8 Nov.		
170	Burton, James	---			264	Burton, John	---		
171	Burton, Richard	18 Oct.			265	Burton, John	---		
172	Burton, John	---			266	Bryan, Loftus Anthony	9 Nov.		
173	Burton, James, jun.	---			267	Burton, Samuel	10 Nov.		
174	Burton, Peter	---			268	Burton, William Thomas	---		
175	Burton, James	---			269	Bates, Alexander	12 Nov.		
176	Burton, William	---			270	Bryan, William	---		
177	Burton, James	---			271	Conry, Thomas R.	15 Oct.		
178	Burton, Frederick	---			272	Carl, Nathaniel	---		
179	Burn, Richard	---			273	Carmichael, John	---		
180	Burns, William	---			274	Carty, James	---		
181	Burton, Alfred	---			275	Cas, Joseph	---		
182	Burns, William	---			276	Casson, George	---		
183	Black, James	---			277	Casper, Robert	---		
184	Booth, James	---			278	Callaghan, Joseph Henry	---		
185	Boyd, Robert	---			279	Coker, William	---		
186	Burton, John	---			280	Carr, William	---		
187	Burton, John	---			281	Crofton, Arthur Hugh	---		
188	Burton, Richard	---			282	Clarke, William	---		
189	Burton, William	---			283	Cornell, George	---		
190	Burns, Alfred	---			284	Clark, George	---		
191	Burns, William	---			285	Clarke, Precious	---		
192	Black, James	---			286	Clarke, Francis	---		
193	Booth, James	---			287	Carron, Stephen	---		
194	Boyd, Robert	---			288	Cassock, Edward	---		
195	Burton, John	---			289	Crow, Charles	---		
196	Burton, Richard	---			290	Chandos, William	---		
197	Burton, William	---			291	Campbell, John	---		
198	Burns, Matthew Tod	---			292	Clancy, Richard	---		
199	Burton, Henry	19 Oct.			293	Carter, Isaac	---		
200	Stickle, Robert	---			294	Campbell, James	---		
201	Burton, Robert	---			295	Chambers Hall	---		
202	Burton, Thomas	---			296	Chico, George	28 Oct.		
203	Burton, Simon	---							
204	Burton, William	---							
205	Burton, James	---							
206	Burdley, William Frederick	---							
207	Burton, Richard	19 Oct.							
208	Burton, Henry	---							
209	Burton, Isaac Burke	---							
210	Burton, John	---							
211	Burton, George	10 Oct.							
212	Box, William Kiddlehead	---							

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[161

No.	NAME.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	NAME.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.
1832—continued.					1832—continued.				
297	Carlson, George	25 Oct.			281	Clements, James	22 Oct.		
298	Carlson, George	—			282	Condon, Richard	—		
299	Carlson, Michael	—			283	Chalkner, William	—		
300	Charles, Richard	—			284	Cerretright, Jeremiah	—		
301	Chase, Michael	—			285	Chesnut, William	—		
302	Cherry, John	—			286	Cotton, Edward	—		
303	Chilton, Rev. Geo. Wm.	—			287	Croate, William	25 Oct.		
304	Chilton, Francis Robert	—			288	Carlson, Oliver	—		
305	Cole, William	29 Oct.			289	Carroll, Edward	—		
306	Colin, Alexander	—			290	Callaghan, John	—		
307	Clark, Courtney	—			291	Coake, James	—		
308	Campbell, William	—			292	Crichton, George	24 Oct.		
309	Chilton, William	—			293	CEO, Joseph	—		
310	Copplewhite, Thomas	—			294	Cope, John	25 Oct.		
311	Cordner, Penlock Charles	—			295	Cope, Joseph	—		
312	Curran, Henry	—			296	Cornwall, Thomas	26 Oct.		
313	Cropper, John	—			297	Craig, Richard	27 Oct.		
314	Crumley, George	—			298	Collins, William	29 Oct.		
315	Clyton, Martin	—			299	Carstairs, James	29 Oct.		
316	Coake, Edward	—			300	Carroll, George	31 Oct.		
317	Clark, Joseph	—			301	Chapin, Joshua Moses	—		
318	Conroy, John	—			302	Curtis, William	—		
319	Clancy, Richard	—			303	Collins, John Neill	1 Nov.		
320	Clark, Mathew	—			304	Croft, John	3 Nov.		
321	Carpenter, William	—			305	Cockburn, Gilbert	5 Nov.		
322	Clatterback, William	—			306	Costa, Francis	—		
323	Courtney, Henry	—			307	Costa, Robinson	—		
324	Crawley, Hugh	—			308	Cotter, George	6 Nov.		
325	Chival, Anthony	—			309	Callan, Edward	—		
326	Craughell, Henry	—			310	Campbell, James	7 Nov.		
327	Crofton, Edward	—			311	Crofton, Ernest Augustus	—		
328	Craughell, William	—			312	Collins, Robert	—		
329	Craughell, James	—			313	Carrick, Robert	—		
330	Crofton, Charles	—			314	Crofton, Capt. R. Hodges	8 Nov.		
331	Carpenter, Alexander	—			315	Chelms, Peter	9 Nov.		
332	Clark, John	—			316	Cuthbert, Thomas	10 Nov.		
333	Carr, George	—			317	Clark, Sir Arthur	11 Nov.		
334	Castle, William	—			318	Carmichael, Zachariah	12 Nov.		
335	Chubb, John	—			319	Cole, Henry	14 Nov.		
336	Clark, George, sen.	—			320	Conner, Edward	15 Nov.		
337	Crofton, Hugh	—			321	Devinon, John L.	20 Oct.		
338	Curtis, Rev. Jos. Timothy	—			322	Dejeanart, Isaac	—		
339	Caldwell, John	10 Oct.	19 Sept.		323	Dejeanart, Stephen	—	10 Oct.	19 Sept.
340	Cornwall, John	—			324	Davis, John James	—		
341	Carr, Wilmotby II.	—			325	Deering, George	—		
342	Clark, James	—			326	Duncan, James	—		
343	Casson, George	—			327	Daly, Peter	—		
344	Callahan, Daniel M.	—			328	Devinon, Stephen Fox	—		
345	Cassanese, Robert	—			329	Doddy, Thomas	—		
346	Casson, George	—			330	DODDY, Isaac	—		
347	Chifford, Robert	—			331	Daly, Samuel Allen	—		
348	Campbell, John	—			332	Dawling, Charles Foster	—		
349	Callahan, Harry	—			333	Dempsey, John	—		
350	Chapin, Joseph	—			334	Dickinson, George	22 Oct.		
351	Carpenter, Christopher	—			335	Doherty, James	—		
352	Callaghan, Christopher	—			336	Doy, James	—		
353	Callaghan, John	20 Oct.			337	Doherty, William	—		
354	Casey, John	—			338	Devon, Jonathan	—		
355	Casey, Francis James	—			339	Dempsey, Frederick	—		
356	Casson, Abraham	—			340	Dempsey, James	—		
357	Collins, Robert	—			341	Devon, Francis	—		
358	Caldwell, Robert	—			342	Devon, Wm. T.	—		
359	Cox, Stephen	—			343	Dolan, Edward Smith	—		
360	Chelms, Richard	—			344	Dempsey, Charles	—		
361	Casper, Rev. William	—			345	Dry, John	—		
362	Crowford, William	—			346	Dodd, William	—		
363	Cree, Robert	—			347	Dunn, Valentine	—		
364	Carmichael, John	—			348	Dunn, Charles	—		
365	Charles, Henry	—			349	Dunn, George	—		
366	Coverdale, James	—			350	Dunn, William	—		
367	Crowford, Edward	—			351	Dodd, William	—		
368	Cook, Lieut.-Col. Henry	—			352	Dunn, Charles	—		
369	Crofton, Richard Harwood	—			353	Dejeanart, Anthony	—		
370	Chiles, Thomas	—			354	Dawling, Thomas	—		
371	Cowell, George	—			355	David, Robert	—		
372	Cole, Richard	—			356	Dejeanart, Stephen	—		
373	Coghlan, Henry	—			357	Dunn, Isaac	—		
374	Cowan, Stephen	—			358	Dickson, Samuel	—		
375	Courtney, Rev. Ay. Lehey	—			359	Dundas, Major Laurence	—		
376	Carrig, Michael	—			360	Dunne, Charles	—		
377	Chapman, John Blair	—			361	Dooly, John	—		
378	Crowford, Rev. Peter	—			362	Dunn, Edward	23 Oct.		
379	Carolan, John	22 Oct.			363	Dooly, Thomas	—		
380	Craig, William	—			364	Dooly, Thomas	—		

(continues)

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.
	1822—continued.					1823—continued.			
443	Dalton, William	22 Oct.			350	Parkear, William	23 Oct.		
444	Dalton, Thomas	—			351	Parke, James	—		
445	Dane, William	—			352	Parlaker, George	—		
446	Dane, George	—			353	Parsons, Joseph	—		
447	Dane, Josias	—			354	Parker, Mack	—		
448	Dalton, Thomas	—			355	Parry, Jasper William	—		
449	Dalton, William	—			356	Parry, William Henry	—		
450	Davidson, John	—			357	Parsons, Francis	—		
451	Deamsted, Henry	—			358	Parsons, John	—		
452	Deal, Alexander	—			359	Parry, Michael	—		
453	Deares, William	24 Oct.			360	Partridge, John	—		
454	Dealey, Samuel	—			361	Partridge, James	—		
455	Deasche, Lewis	—			362	Parker, John	—		
456	Dempsy, Joseph	—			363	Partridge, George	—		
457	Dey, William	25 Oct.			364	Parkear, George	—		
458	Deasche, Robert	—			365	Parry, Charles	—		
459	Dey, James	—			366	Pell, William	24 Oct.		
460	Dobbs, David	—			367	Pell, George	—		
461	Dobbs, Henry	—			368	Powell, William	—		
462	Dove, Joshua	—			369	Partridge, Armstrong	—		
463	Dove, Arthur	—			370	Pour, Joseph	—		
464	Dove, John	—			371	Parry, Joseph	—		
465	Dickinson, John R.	—			372	Partridge, Samuel	—		
466	Dole, John	—			373	Parry, William	—		
467	Dorley, Frederick	26 Oct.			374	Pitt, John	—		
468	Durbach, Wm. T.	—			375	Pitt, Edward	—		
469	Dickson, Drury Jones	27 Oct.			376	Parkear, Alexander	—		
470	Dorley, Frederick	—			377	Parry, George	—		
471	Dixon, Joseph	29 Oct.			378	Parsons, Humphrey	—		
472	Doran, John T.	—			379	Parsons, John Smith	—		
473	Doran, John	30 Oct.			380	Parry, James Thomas	—		
474	Dorham, Francis	—			381	Pitt, Thomas	—		
475	Doran, Charles	—			382	Pell, John	—		
476	Doran, George	31 Oct.			383	Parsons, Fred. Digby	—		
477	Dorson, Thomas	—			384	Parry, John	—		
478	Dickinson, Wm.	1 Nov.			385	Pigg, Samuel	—		
479	Dorham, Howard Berry	—			386	Pax, Rev. Smith W.	25 Oct.		
480	Dosford, George	5 Nov.			387	Parsons, Richard	—		
481	Doran, William	—			388	Parsons, William	—		
482	Dorson, John	—			389	Partridge, James	—		
483	Dill, Robert	6 Nov.			390	Pitt, Thomas Luttrell	—		
484	Doran, Susan	—			391	Parry, John Smith	26 Oct.	10 Oct.	18 Sept.
485	Digby, Thomas George	7 Nov.	30 Oct.	18 Sept.	392	Partridge, James	—		
486	Doran, Arthur	10 Nov.	—		393	Parsons, Godfrey	—		
487	Dole, James	12 Nov.	—		394	Parker, Charles	—		
488	D'Ober, Joseph	—			395	Pell, John	—		
489	Dorley, William	14 Nov.	—		396	Parry, Thomas	—		
490	Darson, Edward	25 Oct.	—		397	Parry, George	29 Oct.		
491	Doran, William	—			398	Parry, Richard	—		
492	Doran, John	—			399	Parry, William	—		
493	Doran, Nicholas	—			400	Parry, Charles	20 Oct.		
494	Doran, Elizabeth	—			401	Partridge, Charles	21 Oct.		
495	Doran, John Smith	—			402	Parsons, Andrew	—		
496	Doran, William	—			403	Parker, Henry	1 Nov.		
497	Doran, John	—			404	Parry, Henry Johnston	—		
498	Doran, Samuel	—			405	Partridge, Wm. Harry	5 Nov.		
499	Doran, William	—			406	Parry, George	—		
500	Doran, Nicholas	—			407	Parry, Wm. Henry	—		
501	Doran, Elizabeth	—			408	Parsons, Thomas	—		
502	Doran, John Smith	—			409	Pax, Thomas	6 Nov.		
503	Doran, Edward Thomas	—			410	Parsons, Richard	—		
504	Doran, Alice	24 Oct.			411	Parsons, Robert Becker	—		
505	Doran, John	—			412	Parry, Charles	9 Nov.		
506	Doran, William	—			413	Parry, Richard	—		
507	Doran, Andrew	—			414	Parsons, John	10 Nov.		
508	Doran, George	—			415	Parry, Robert Henry	—		
509	Doran, William	—			416	Grabbam, William	23 Oct.		
510	Doran, William	—			417	Gorser, Josh. Henry	—		
511	Doran, James	—			418	Galloway, John	24 Oct.		
512	Doran, John Crosswell	25 Oct.			419	Grabbam, Andrew	—		
513	Doran, Wm. Thomas	—			420	Grant, William	—		
514	Doran, William	—			421	Gloucester, Talbot	—		
515	Doran, Henry	26 Oct.			422	Grabbam, James	—		
516	Doran, Gilbert	—			423	Griffith, William	—		
517	Doran, George	27 Oct.			424	Grant, James	—		
518	Doran, Hugh	1 Nov.			425	Grabbam, William	—		
519	Doran, Richard B.	5 Nov.			426	Grabbam, John	—		
520	Doran, John T.	6 Nov.			427	Grubb, Michael	—		
521	Doran, Robert	—			428	Gilbert, Robert	—		
522	Doran, William	8 Nov.			429	Grabbam, William	—		
523	Doran, James	9 Nov.			430	Grabbam, Wm. Harris	—		
524	Doran, Charles B.	10 Nov.			431	Gray, John	—		
525	Doran, George	23 Oct.			432	Gray, John	—		
					433	Gwynne, Hugh Nelson	—		

No.	NAME.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	NAME.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.
1850—continued.					1850—continued.				
634	Gwynne, Rev. W.	24 Oct.			710	Heyland, Rowley	24 Oct.		
635	Groat, Henry	—			711	Hinds, Isaac	—		
636	Groat, William	—			712	Hinchcock, John	—		
637	Gillespie, George	—			713	Hinchcock, Robert	—		
638	Gray, Andrew	—			714	Holt, William	—		
639	Gray, John	—			715	Hart, Charles	—		
640	Goodman, Thomas	—			716	Hatcheson, Christopher	—		
641	George, John	—			717	Hedden, John Elton	—		
642	George, Matthew	—			718	Hewson, John	—		
643	Gallagher, Thomas	—			719	Harris, Henry	—		
644	Griffin, Thomas	—			720	Hodges, George	—		
645	Griffin, Hovenden	—			721	Hodges, John	—		
646	Grice, William	—			722	Hodson, John	—		
647	Grice, Charles	—			723	Harris, Joseph	—		
648	Grice, Richard	—			724	Hosie, John Lloyd	—		
649	Gibson, John	—			725	Hatchell, George	—		
650	Glaucok, Walter	—			726	Johnson, Charles	—		
651	Gray, Andrew	—			727	Hill, George	—		
652	Graves, William	25 Oct.			728	Higgins, Richard	—		
653	Goldsmith, Joseph	—			729	Hughes, Andrew	—		
654	Gorry, William	—			730	Homer, Richard	—		
655	Grylls, Newnham	—			731	Hughes, Stephen	—		
656	Graves, Samuel	—			732	Hartick, William	—		
657	Gardiner, Arthur	—			733	Hacker, Michael	25 Oct.		
658	Grable, Samuel	—			734	Keane, Nathaniel	—		
659	Gordon, Samuel	—			735	Keane, Humphrey	—		
660	Grice, George	—			736	Keenock, William	—		
661	Grice, John	—			737	Kings, Samuel Henry B.	—		
662	Grice, William	—			738	Kear, John	—		
663	Grice, William	—			739	Kepner, Benjamin	—		
664	Grice, Henry D'Ober	—			740	Kerney, William	—		
665	Grice, Edward	—			741	Kerney, Robert	—		
666	Gillespie, Charles	—			742	Kerney, Robert	—		
667	Gook, Thomas	—			743	Kerney, Hans James	—		
668	Grice, Geo. Browne	25 Oct.			744	Kear, John	—		
669	Gregory, Joseph	—			745	Kepner, Benjamin	—		
670	Gordon, Charles F.	—			746	Kerney, William	—		
671	Gregory, William	—			747	Kerney, Robert	—		
672	Grimson, Henry	—			748	Kerney, Hans James	—		
673	Griffin, James	—			749	Kear, John	—		
674	Griffin, Samuel	—			750	Higgins, William	—		
675	Grice, Thomas	—			751	Kear, Thomas	—		
676	Griffin, William	—			752	Heady, Peter Flanaghan	—		
677	Guinness, Robert R.	30 Oct.	19 Sept.		753	Heady, Fitzgibbon	—		
678	Grice, William	—			754	Hagan, James	—		
679	Gordon, James	27 Oct.			755	Hagan, Theobald	—		
680	Groat, Rev. Jos. B.	—			756	Harrington, Tho. Pools	—		
681	Grice, Malaworth	—			757	Harris, Richard	—		
682	Grice, Rowdon Griffiths	—			758	Hatchinson, John	10 Oct.	19 Sept.	
683	Griffin, George	29 Oct.			759	Henry, Joseph	—		
684	Guinness, Richard	—			760	Harris, Robert	—		
685	Griffin, William	30 Oct.			761	Higgins, George	—		
686	Glyn, William	—			762	Harris, Thomas	—		
687	Gibbs, George	31 Oct.			763	Hampson, Chr. Wm.	—		
688	Gregg, John	—			764	Houghton, George	—		
689	Grice, John	—			765	Hove, Addison	—		
690	Gilman, James	1 Nov.			766	Hawkins, Charles	—		
691	Gibson, Charles	—			767	Halligan, James	—		
692	Gerrill, Samuel	2 Nov.			768	Harrison, John	—		
693	Gosse, William	—			769	Hughes, James	20 Oct.		
694	Gosson, Robert	—			770	Hughes, Robert	—		
695	Guinness, William Land	2 Nov.			771	Hughes, James	—		
696	Guinness, Arthur Lee	2 Nov.			772	Hughes, William	—		
697	Guinness, Benjamin Lee	—			773	Hyde, George	—		
698	Guinness, Arthur	—			774	Hamilton, John	—		
699	Gillespie, William	—			775	Hamilton, Jas. Richard	—		
700	Gibson, Christopher	—			776	Hemel, Wm. Rapt	—		
701	Guinness, Thomas	6 Nov.			777	Hepson, John	—		
702	George, John, jun.	—			778	Heron, John	—		
703	Gosse, Henry Thomas	7 Nov.			779	Hill, George	—		
704	Giles, Edward	8 Nov.			780	Holmes, William	—		
705	Gregory, John	—			781	Hobson, Joseph	—		
706	Gibson, John	—			782	Hutch, Simon	—		
707	Gibson, Francis	—			783	Harris, Joseph, sen.	—		
708	Gosse, Thomas	9 Nov.			784	Harding, Jonathan	—		
709	Garry, William	12 Nov.			785	Hay, Montford John	—		
710	Greene, Ambrose	13 Nov.			786	Hazelton, Joseph	—		
711	Gordon, Michael	14 Nov.			787	Healy, Michael	—		
712	Hempell, Richard	15 Nov.			788	Healy, Thomas	—		
713	Hill, William	16 Nov.			789	Harris, Joseph, sen.	—		
714	Hill, William	18 Oct.			790	Hedden, John	—		
715	Harkness, George	22 Oct.			791	Hendon, Joseph	—		
716	Hartford, Henry	24 Oct.			792	Hedden, Michael	—		
717	Harris, Christopher	—			793	Hend, Thomas	—		
					794	Harris, Henry	—		
					795	Hughes, John	—		
					796	Harty, William	—		
					797	Richard, Wilfred	—		
					798	Harrison, Abraham	—		
					799	Hicks, Anthony	27 Oct.		
					800	Hedger, William	—		
					801	Hedger, James	—		
						Hilpin, George	—		

APPENDIX TO REPORT FROM THE

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.
1835—continued.					1835—continued.				
807	Howell, George	27 Oct.			895	Jarrett, Thomas	30 Oct.		
808	Harding, John	—			897	Judge, John	—		
804	Harrington, James	—			898	Jackson, Joshua	—		
805	Harrison, William	—			899	Jonesman, James A.	—		
806	Holpin, William	—			890	Irvine, James	—		
807	Hoolings, John David	—			891	Jones, Thomas	—		
808	Holmes, Francis Gordon	—			892	Irvine, Joseph	—		
809	Hill, Thomas	—			893	Jones, John	—		
810	Hurdice, Wm. Stewart	—			894	Irvine, Richard Phibbs	—		
811	Harrison, Thomas	29 Oct.			895	Johnston, George	27 Oct.		
812	Hutton, Thomas	—			896	Johnston, Samuel	—		
813	Hasterville, George	—			897	Ingram, Hall	—		
814	Horn, Joseph	—			898	Jibsch, John Highmore	—		
815	Howden, Robert	—			899	Jones, Charles	—		
816	Holahan, George	—			900	Jackson, William, jun.	20 Oct.		
817	Hess, Richard	—			901	Jackson, William	—		
818	Halpin, George	—			902	Irvine, Thomas	—		
819	Horton, Joshua	—			903	Jones, Walter	—		
820	Higginbotham, Henry	—			904	Johnson, John	—		
821	Hepensell, George	—			905	Johnston, William	30 Oct.		
822	Henderson, Robert	30 Oct.			906	Johnson, Edmund	—		
823	Lloyd, Henry	—			907	Jackson, Robert	—		
824	Holten, Samuel	—			908	Jones, William	31 Oct.		
825	Hampfry, Charles	—			909	Jackson, Samuel	—		
826	Hemilton, John	31 Oct.			910	Jackson, Joseph D.	—		
827	Holton, John Wm.	—			911	Jackson, Wm.	—		
828	Harwood, Thomas	—			912	Jolly, Henry	—		
829	Hutton, Bartholomew	—			913	Jones, Edward	1 Nov.		
830	Hely, Edward	—			914	Jackson, Samuel, sen.	—		
831	Hutchinson, John	—			915	Jones, Richard, jun.	—		
832	Hamilton, Francis	1 Nov.			916	Jones, Richard	—		
833	Holmes, Stephen	—			917	Irvine, George	2 Nov.		
834	Hemilton, James	—			918	Jackson, George	3 Nov.		
835	Hays, Thomas	—			919	Jones, John	—		
836	Hutchingson, Samuel	2 Nov.			920	Jones, Joseph	5 Nov.		
837	Hemilton, Mervyn	—			921	Jones, John	—		
838	Howkins, John	—			922	Johnston, William	—		
839	Hess, William	—			923	Jones, George	—		
840	Hedden, William	—			924	Jackson, Peter	—		
841	Henderson, James	8 Nov.			925	Jones, Edward	—		
842	Hewicks, Dudley	—			926	Jones, Thomas	—		
843	Holmes, Robert Burton	—	10 Oct.	12 Sept.	927	Jones, John	—	10 Oct.	12 Sept.
844	Hall, Robert	5 Nov.			928	Jawter, William	5 Nov.		
845	Hays, Robert	—			929	Jones, John Hope	—		
846	Holmes, Robert	—			930	Jones, Humphrey	—		
847	Harrison, Francis	6 Nov.			931	Jones, James	7 Nov.		
848	Hickman, Edward Stader.	—			932	Jackson, William	—		
849	Hall, John	—			933	Jones, William	8 Nov.		
850	Hanna, Robert	7 Nov.			934	Jones, William	9 Nov.		
851	Hope, George	—			935	Irishod, William	10 Nov.		
852	Hetherington, George	—			936	Jones, Francis	—		
853	Holmes, William	—			937	Johnson, Joseph	—		
854	Hearly, Daniel	—			938	Jones, James	—		
855	Hemilton, Robert	—			939	Jones, Thomas	14 Nov.		
856	Hughson, William	8 Nov.			940	Johnston, Andrew	—		
857	Howard, Gilbert	—			941	Jackson, Alexander	15 Nov.		
858	Hoghton, Cooper	—			942	Jackson, Humphrey	—		
859	Holmes, John	—			943	King, Robert	23 Oct.		
860	Howard, Alfred	9 Nov.			944	Kennedy, James	24 Oct.		
861	Harrison, James	—			945	King, Samuel	25 Oct.		
862	Hedgcock, Francis	—			946	Kilham, George	—		
863	Holmes, Joseph	—			947	Kel, John Thomas	—		
864	Hemilton, James	10 Nov.			948	Kilham, Daniel	—		
865	Hodges, William	—			949	Kelly, John	—		
866	Hope, William	12 Nov.			950	Kilham, Robert Henry	—		
867	Hill, William	13 Nov.			951	Kennedy, John	26 Oct.		
868	Hardy, Philip D.	14 Nov.			952	Kiwan, Patrick	—		
869	Higges, John	15 Nov.			953	Kelly, John	—		
870	Haines, James	—			954	Kirkend, John	27 Oct.		
871	Harold, George	—			955	Kennedy, James	—		
872	Irvine, George	24 Oct.			956	Kingston, Rev. Thomas	—		
873	Jackson, Joseph	—			957	Kennedy, John	—		
874	Inland, Richard Stanley	—			958	Killiger, John	—		
875	Johnston, Richard	—			959	Killiger, Ch.	29 Oct.		
876	Joneson, James	—			960	Kirwan, Mich. Brown	—		
877	Jones, Sir J. Kingston	—			961	Kennedy, Hickman	—		
878	Irvine, Hugh	25 Oct.			962	Kempson, Harry	—		
879	Jessons, Thomas	—			963	Kragg, John	30 Oct.		
880	Jordan, Henry Wm.	—			964	Kelly, Denis Henry	—		
881	Joneson, Robert	26 Oct.			965	Kroft, Samuel	—		
882	Jones, Edward	—			966	King, Wm. South	31 Oct.		
883	Jackson, Thomas	—			967	Kimberly, Mark Job.	—		
884	Jackson, John	—			968	Keith, James	1 Nov.		
885	Jesson, James	—			969	Kelly, John	2 Nov.		

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[165

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.
	1831—continued.					1832—continued.			
970	King, Arthur	2 Nov.			1054	La George, George, sen.	5 Nov.		
971	Kings, Henry	3 Nov.			1055	Langan, Benjamin	6 Nov.		
972	Kispanan, Nicholas	5 Nov.			1056	Lucas, William	—		
973	Kane, Joseph Thomas	—			1057	Love, Nathaniel	7 Nov.		
974	King, James	—			1058	Lowe, Robert William	—		
975	Kennedy, Joshua	—			1059	Lowe, Henry	—		
976	Kanng, George	—			1060	Lombert, Oliver Richard	12 Nov.		
977	King, James Walker	—			1061	London, David	14 Nov.		
978	Kennedy, Thomas Francis	7 Nov.			1062	Lomb, Joseph	—		
979	Kearney, Hickman, jun.	—			1063	Lombert, David	16 Nov.		
980	Knox, Samuel	—			1064	McCready, Wills Hill	18 Oct.		
981	Kelly, Nicholas D.	8 Nov.			1065	McNaghen, Robert	19 Oct.		
982	Kathens, John	12 Nov.			1066	McCarty, Thomas	19 Oct.		
983	Kinder, George	—			1067	McKee, Thomas	24 Oct.		
984	Kane, Robert	13 Nov.			1068	Madlock, William, sen.	—		
985	Love, Peter	22 Oct.			1069	Madlock, Joseph	—		
986	La Touche, Theophilus D.	22 Oct.			1070	Madlock, William, jun.	—		
987	La Touche, Rev. J. J. D.	—			1071	Mafer, William	—		
988	Lodge, John	—			1072	Moran, John	—		
989	Long, William	—			1073	Morrison, James	—		
990	Long, John	—			1074	Montgomery, Alexander	—		
991	Lynn, James	—			1075	Montgomery, Alexander	—		
992	Lyster, James	—			1076	Montgomery, John	—		
993	Lee, Samuel Percy	24 Oct.			1077	Montgomery, Philip	—		
994	Liddell, John	—			1078	Montgomery, Thomas	—		
995	Lodge, William Bate	—			1079	Morley, William	—		
996	Logan, William	—			1080	Murphy, H. John	25 Oct.		
997	Loyd, Cornelius	—			1081	Musack, George	—		
998	Lacey, Joshua	25 Oct.			1082	Myers, Joseph St. Clair	—		
999	London, Joseph	—			1083	Myers, Charles H., sen.	—		
1000	Lemprey, James	—			1084	Myers, Charles H., jun.	—		
1001	Lemprey, William	—			1085	Myers, George F.	—		
1002	Lempson, Joseph	—			1086	Richardson, William	—		
1003	Law, Robert	—			1087	Rich, Francis	—		
1004	Lawrence, Samuel	—			1088	Riley, Samuel	—		
1005	Lawrence, Richard	—			1089	Roller, Robert	—		
1006	Leahy, William	—			1090	Rosenworth, Hubert R.	—		
1007	Lever, James	—			1091	Montgomery, Robert	—		
1008	Lindsay, David	—			1092	Moore, Actance	—		
1009	Locke, Thomas	—			1093	Morris, George	—		
1010	Lodge, Robert	—			1094	Mulla, Joseph	—		
1011	Lloyd, John	—			1095	Murphy, John	—		
1012	Loupney, Joseph	26 Oct.	10 Oct.	19 Sept.	1096	Murphy, Charles	10 Oct.	18 Sept.	
1013	Loughran, Nicholas	—			1097	Murray, John, jun.	—		
1014	Leelan, Francis	—			1098	McCloskey, George	—		
1015	Leach, William	—			1099	McLaughlin, Andrew	—		
1016	Lodge, Francis	—			1100	McMahon, Alexander	—		
1017	Long, James	—			1101	McCusker, James William	—		
1018	Lewis, John	—			1102	Madigan, James F.	—		
1019	Ledwith, William	—			1103	Madlock, Simon	—		
1020	Leat, Ambrose	—			1104	Magnath, Mark	—		
1021	La George, Charles	—			1105	McCandy, William	—		
1022	Lynn, Daniel	27 Oct.			1106	Mahony, Isaac	—		
1023	Lee, Francis	—			1107	Mahy, Edward	—		
1024	Leopard, Thomas Jones	—			1108	Marwick, Robert	—		
1025	Lewis, Michael	—			1109	McCready, James	26 Oct.		
1026	Ledwith, James	29 Oct.			1110	McCreech, John	—		
1027	Legrange, George, jun.	—			1111	McCree, Rev. John	—		
1028	Lynch, James	—			1112	McChis, Christopher	—		
1029	L'Estrange, Henry	—			1113	McCleary, David	—		
1030	Lewton, William	—			1114	McCleary, Samuel	—		
1031	Loughton, Nicholas J.	—			1115	McCleary, Samuel	—		
1032	Leper, William	—			1116	Mama, Howe Gusto	—		
1033	Lacey, Michael Brown	—			1117	Mathews, Patrick	—		
1034	Lawrence, Thomas	30 Oct.			1118	Maurice, William	—		
1035	Lady, James	—			1119	Moan, Jacob	—		
1036	Lynn, Maurice	31 Oct.			1120	Mills, Wilson	—		
1037	Lindsay, Robert	—			1121	Miller, Luke	—		
1038	Lobby, Thomas	—			1122	Mills, Richard	—		
1039	Lobby, Jeffrey	—			1123	Moran, James	—		
1040	Long, Thomas	—			1124	Morrison, William	—		
1041	Lambert, John	—			1125	Moss, Charles Benjamin	—		
1042	Lefroy, Thomas, jun.	1 Nov.			1126	Mosley, David	—		
1043	Hewitt, James	—			1127	Moyes, William	—		
1044	Lewis, Richard	—			1128	Mullen, William	—		
1045	La Touche, John David	—			1129	Mulligan, Thomas	—		
1046	Lombert, William J.	—			1130	Murray, John	—		
1047	Loughran, Charles	2 Nov.			1131	McDonnell, Anthony	—		
1048	Lemprey, Samuel	—			1132	McKay, Daniel	—		
1049	Ledwith, Richard	—			1133	McKenry, John	—		
1050	Lowe, Josiah	—			1134	MacLean, Rev. Henry	—		
1051	Lawrence, Samuel	—			1135	McMullen, James	—		
1052	Lyster, James West	3 Nov.			1136	McNally, John	—		
1053	Liton, Edward	—			1137	Maguire, Edward	—		

(continued)

No.	NAME.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	NAME.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.
1830—continued.					1830—continued.				
1131	Maguire, Morgan	26 Oct.			1229	Malone, Joseph	5 Nov.		
1132	Martin, James				1230	Martin, David			
1140	McCook, John	27 Oct.			1294	McDonald, Francis			
1141	McDonald, Archibald				1235	McElderton, Thomas			
1142	Marquis, George				1226	Murray, Edward			
1143	Molloy, William				1277	McLaughlin, Richard	6 Nov.		
1144	Moore, Oliver				1298	Moyle, John			
1145	Moore, Lieut.-Col. George				1229	McHellen, John			
1146	Morgan, William				1230	Morris, William			
1147	Murray, John				1251	Masters, Henry C.	7 Nov.		
1148	Murray, George				1252	Maypatrick, Henry			
1149	Myer, Joseph				1253	McCleary, John			
1150	Murray, William				1254	Moore, Daniel			
1151	Murray, Edward				1255	Mullen, David			
1152	Montgomery, Samuel				1256	Mills, John S.	8 Nov.		
1153	Mothers, John				1257	Moore, James			
1154	Mosler, Samuel				1258	Murphy, John			
1155	Mosden, Henry				1259	McMullen, Richard	9 Nov.		
1156	Moskin, Thomas				1240	McCleary, Matthew	10 Nov.		
1157	McQuarrie, William				1241	McDonnell, John			
1158	McAloon, Robert	30 Oct.			1242	McFarland, Curtis			
1159	McAlister, Daniel				2243	Naggar, Bernard			
1160	McCoy, George				1244	Moore, Robert			
1161	McCullagh, John				1245	Moore, Edward			
1162	McCune, John				1246	McDonnell, George, sen.	12 Nov.		
1163	McNeil, Joseph				1247	Neely, Charles			
1164	Maddock, S. John				1248	Montgomery, James			
1165	Maguire, Alexander				1249	McMullen, Thomas			
1166	Magge, George				1250	McCready, Charles	13 Nov.		
1167	Mann, James				1251	McLaughlin, Richard			
1168	Mackie, Robert				1252	McGill, James			
1169	Miller, Thomas				1253	McDonnell, George	14 Nov.		
1170	Mitchel, John				1254	Needham, Thomas R.	20 Oct.		
1171	Mitchel, Oliver P.				1255	Newell, Joseph A.	24 Oct.		
1172	Moore, George				1256	Norman, Frederick			
1173	Moore, Richard				1257	North, Thomas			
1174	Morehead, Juliana				1258	North, John	25 Oct.		
1175	Morrison, James				1259	Newall, William			
1176	Morrison, Robert				1260	Newman, Samuel			
1177	Murray, Peter				1261	Nixon, Robert			
1178	Myles, George	30 Oct.			1262	Norman, John			
1179	Morrison, Hugh				1263	Newton, John	26 Oct.	10 Oct.	19 Sept.
1180	Moore, John		10 Oct.	19 Sept.	1264	Norman, Richard G.			
1181	Moore, John				1265	North, William			
1182	McNabb, Joseph				1266	Naggar, Sir Edward	27 Oct.		
1183	McEster, Hugh				1267	Naggar, Robert	29 Oct.		
1184	McDonnell, Thomas				1268	Nevin, Thomas			
1185	Muller, William				1270	Newark, William			
1186	Murphy, Robert				1271	Nicholls, John			
1187	Muller, John				1272	Nixon, James	30 Oct.		
1188	Mason, Abraham				1273	North, John			
1189	Mason, Thomas				1274	North, John			
1190	Maguire, Thomas				1275	Newcombe, William	31 Oct.		
1191	Mason, William				1276	Norwood, Benjamin			
1192	McCarthy, Charles	31 Oct.			1277	Newsham, Edward W.	6 Nov.		
1193	Magge, James				1278	Newsham, Edw. W. jun.			
1194	Maley, William				1279	Neill, Robert	5 Nov.		
1195	Manders, John				1280	Newcombe, Wm. Ed.			
1196	McIlken, Thomas R.				1281	Nicholls, Luke			
1197	McConnell, Wm. James	1 Nov.			1282	Nicholson, Samuel			
1198	McCullagh, William				1283	Nethleton, George	6 Nov.		
1199	Molloy, Thomas				1284	Newton, George, jun.			
1200	Mooney, Thomas				1285	Norman, Luke			
1201	Meyler, John	2 Nov.			1286	Norman, Thomas			
1202	Mitchell, William				1287	North, John			
1203	Moore, George				1288	North, William			
1204	McCann, Samuel, jun.				1289	Naggar, William			
1205	McGuire, Edward				1290	Neville, Sir Garrett	7 Nov.		
1206	Medden, Matthew				1291	Norman, Andrew	8 Nov.		
1207	Mathews, Samuel				1292	Newton, Willoughby	10 Nov.		
1208	Mansfield, George				1293	Norman, Robert	13 Nov.		
1209	Mansfield, Nicholas M.				1294	O'Keefe, Thomas H.	30 Oct.		
1210	McCann, Samuel, sen.				1295	O'Keefe, William	34 Oct.		
1211	McCullagh, Alexander	5 Nov.			1296	O'Keefe, Andrew N.			
1212	McDonnell, Michael				1297	O'Brien, George	25 Oct.		
1213	McKenney, Seale				1298	Ogle, Richard G.			
1214	McMann, Henry				1299	O'Keefe, Arthur			
1215	Mathews, John				1300	O'Keefe, Thomas			
1216	Martine, William, jun.				1301	O'Keefe, John			
1217	Moore, Frederick				1302	O'Keefe, James	26 Oct.		
1218	Morrison, Arthur				1303	O'Keefe, William			
1219	Morrison, Richard				1304	Orr, James			
1220	McLaine, John	5 Nov.			1305	Oulton, Richard			
1221	McLaughlin, John								

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[107

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Season.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Season.	Date of Notice of Registry.
	1895—continued.					1895—continued.			
1200	O'Callaghan, Andrew	27 Oct.			1391	Pross, Thomas	31 Oct.		
1207	Oulton, Charles	—			1392	Paton, Henry Richard	1 Nov.		
1208	Oulston, John	29 Oct.			1393	Perry, Arthur	—		
1209	O'Leary, William	30 Oct.			1394	Peter, Matthew David	—		
1210	O'Leary, Richard William	—			1395	Phelps, John	—		
1211	Orpen, Richard John	1 Nov.			1396	Phillips, Abel	—		
1212	Orosly, Thomas	—			1397	Pollock, Thomas H.	—		
1213	O'Leary, Jeremiah	9 Nov.			1398	Pollock, Hudson	—		
1214	O'Leary, George	—			1399	Polson, William	—		
1215	O'Brien, Peter	3 Nov.			1400	Post, George	2 Nov.		
1217	O'Brien, Edward	3 Nov.			1401	Postgate, Henry	3 Nov.		
1218	O'Shea, Dermot	6 Nov.			1402	Powell, Thomas, jun.	—		
1219	O'Hara, Henry	7 Nov.			1403	Poston, John	—		
1220	Orpin, John	—			1404	Prater, Walter	—		
1221	Orr, Robert	8 Nov.			1405	Prater, Anthony	3 Nov.		
1222	Orosly, William	10 Nov.			1406	Papworth, John Thomas	—		
1223	Orsler, George	23 Oct.			1407	Pratt, Daniel	—		
1224	Orsler, Frank T.	24 Oct.			1408	Pratt, Richard	—		
1225	Orsler, Edward	25 Oct.			1409	Pratt, Charles	—		
1226	Orsler, John	—			1410	Pratt, William H.	6 Nov.		
1227	Orsler, Benjamin	—			1411	Pratt, John	—		
1228	Orsler, Edward	—			1412	Pratt, Augustus	—		
1229	Orsler, Pierre	—			1413	Pratt, Walter	—		
1230	Orsler, Nathaniel	—			1414	Pratt, Blizard	—		
1231	Orsler, William	—			1415	Pratt, Abraham	—		
1232	Orsler, Robert	—			1416	Pratt, Nathaniel	—		
1233	Orsler, Andrew	—			1417	Pratt, Richard	7 Nov.		
1234	Orsler, George	—			1418	Pratt, John Rose	—		
1235	Orsler, Arthur	—			1419	Pratt, Edward	—		
1236	Orsler, William	—			1420	Pratt, Thomas	8 Nov.		
1237	Orsler, Thomas	—			1421	Pratt, George	11 Nov.		
1238	Orsler, John E.	—			1422	Pratt, Thomas	—		
1239	Orsler, John	—			1423	Pratt, Joseph	13 Nov.		
1240	Orsler, George	—			1424	Pratt, William	14 Nov.		
1241	Orsler, Patrick William	—			1425	Pratt, Thomas J.	26 Oct.		
1242	Orsler, James	—			1426	Pratt, Joseph	29 Oct.		
1243	Orsler, George	—			1427	Pratt, Edward	—		
1244	Orsler, Thomas	—			1428	Pratt, Thomas	6 Nov.		
1245	Orsler, James	—			1429	Pratt, Edward H.	24 Oct.		
1246	Orsler, Louis	—			1430	Pratt, Alexander	25 Oct.		
1247	Orsler, George	—			1431	Pratt, William	—		
1248	Orsler, Thomas	—			1432	Pratt, John	26 Oct.		
1249	Orsler, James	—	10 Oct.	10 Sept.	1433	Pratt, Jolly William	—	30 Oct.	10 Sept.
1250	Orsler, Thomas	—			1434	Pratt, William	—		
1251	Orsler, John	—			1435	Pratt, Arthur H.	—		
1252	Orsler, Samuel	27 Oct.			1436	Pratt, Thomas	—		
1253	Orsler, Richard	—			1437	Pratt, Allen	—		
1254	Orsler, John	—			1438	Pratt, Sir David Charles	—		
1255	Orsler, James	—			1439	Pratt, David	—		
1256	Orsler, Thomas	—			1440	Pratt, Henry	21 Oct.		
1257	Orsler, John	—			1441	Pratt, William	—		
1258	Orsler, John	—			1442	Pratt, William	—		
1259	Orsler, Edward	—			1443	Pratt, Robert	—		
1260	Orsler, Thomas	—			1444	Pratt, James	—		
1261	Orsler, George	—			1445	Pratt, Peter	—		
1262	Orsler, Robert	—			1446	Pratt, Alexander	—		
1263	Orsler, Robert M.	—			1447	Pratt, William	—		
1264	Orsler, Christian H.	—			1448	Pratt, Andrew	—		
1265	Orsler, Francis	—			1449	Pratt, Andrew, jun.	—		
1266	Orsler, Robert	—			1450	Pratt, James F.	—		
1267	Orsler, Jacob	—			1451	Pratt, Samuel	29 Oct.		
1268	Orsler, Josiah	—			1452	Pratt, Anthony	—		
1269	Orsler, William W.	—			1453	Pratt, William	—		
1270	Orsler, William	29 Oct.			1454	Pratt, Samuel	—		
1271	Orsler, Joshua	—			1455	Pratt, George	—		
1272	Orsler, John	—			1456	Pratt, Charles	—		
1273	Orsler, George	—			1457	Pratt, George	—		
1274	Orsler, William	—			1458	Pratt, Thomas	—		
1275	Orsler, John	—			1459	Pratt, Thomas	—		
1276	Orsler, John	—			1460	Pratt, William	—		
1277	Orsler, Edward	—			1461	Pratt, William	—		
1278	Orsler, Isaac	—			1462	Pratt, John	—		
1279	Orsler, Francis T.	—			1463	Pratt, Thomas	—		
1280	Orsler, William	—			1464	Pratt, Bartholomew	—		
1281	Orsler, Peter	—			1465	Pratt, William H.	—		
1282	Orsler, Robert	—			1466	Pratt, Edward	—		
1283	Orsler, Samuel	30 Oct.			1467	Pratt, James	—		
1284	Orsler, William	—			1468	Pratt, Richard	—		
1285	Orsler, William H.	—			1469	Pratt, Richard	30 Oct.		
1286	Orsler, William	—			1470	Pratt, Irvine	—		
1287	Orsler, George	—			1471	Pratt, William	—		
1288	Orsler, Robert	—			1472	Pratt, Stephen	—		
1289	Orsler, John	31 Oct.			1473	Pratt, Robert	—		
1290	Orsler, Edward	—			1474	Pratt, Edward	—		

(continued)

APPENDIX TO REPORT FROM THE

168]

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Season.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Season.	Date of Notice of Registry.
1833—continued.					1850—continued.				
1473	Ryan, Henry	30 Oct.			1550	Smith, George	19 Oct.		
1474	Rawlin, Thomas	31 Oct.			1551	Sprad, Robert D.			
1477	Reed, Alexander				1561	Starrall, James			
1478	Rehman, Patrick				1562	Stewart, John			
1479	Rickard, Oscar				1563	Stevally, James			
1480	Rochy, William				1564	Stedman, Michael			
1481	Robinson, V. Allen				1565	Stoddart, George			
1482	Reynolds, Paul	1 Nov.			1566	Stephens, Edward			
1483	Rice, Thomas Samuel				1567	Stetham, John			
1484	Ridgway, William				1568	Stockman, William			
1485	Ridley, James	2 Nov.			1569	Stephens, Joseph			
1486	Rinney, John A.	3 Nov.			1570	Stoker, Abraham			
1487	Roche, Richard	3 Nov.			1571	Stovall, Rev. Robert			
1488	Roid, Thomas				1572	Sturges, Edward			
1489	Rickardson, John				1573	Stammers, Edward			
1490	Roche, Henry				1574	Surple, Edward			
1491	Rodolph, Right Hon. John	4 Nov.			1575	Sunderland, Thomas B.			
1492	Roever, Edward				1576	Sweeney, John			
1493	Roever, Samuel S.				1577	Szal, Thomas			
1494	Ruskell, Robert				1578	Scott, Henry	20 Oct.		
1495	Robinson, William				1579	Stase, Robert			
1496	Ryan, Percival				1580	Stearns, John F.			
1497	Ryan, Robert				1581	Shaw, James			
1498	Richardson, Henry	7 Nov.			1582	Shaw, John			
1499	Richardson, William				1583	Sherry, John			
1500	Robinson, John				1584	Smith, Joshua			
1501	Robinson, William				1585	Smith, Henry			
1502	Ross, Benjamin				1586	Smith, Brett			
1503	Ridgway, William	8 Nov.			1587	Smith, William			
1504	Roberts, Robert				1588	Smith, John			
1505	Richardson, George C.	10 Nov.			1589	Smith, Maximilian			
1506	Rudolph, Joseph	12 Nov.			1590	Smyth, Robert			
1507	Ruddy, Henry				1591	Smith, Henry			
1508	Ryan, John				1592	Spaw, John			
1509	Ryan, Edward	13 Nov.			1593	Stephenson, William			
1510	Scaris, William	25 Oct.			1594	Stroplin, James			
1511	Shaw, Frederick				1595	Sturgeson, William			
1512	Smith, Robert				1596	Stevens, William			
1513	Scriven, John B.	24 Oct.			1597	Stevens, John			
1514	Shaw, Edward S.				1598	Steele, George			
1515	Steele, Richard				1599	Stevens, William			
1516	Sutor, Robert				1600	Stokes, John, Jun.			
1517	Scott, William	25 Oct.	10 Oct.	19 Sept.	1601	Stonkey, Richard James	21 Oct.	10 Oct.	19 Sept.
1518	Smith, William				1602	Stokes, William			
1519	Sladens, Thomas				1603	Temple, John			
1520	Sladens, Ramsey				1604	Sturwood, James			
1521	Smyth, Nicholas				1605	Shelly, Samuel			
1522	Smiles, James	26 Oct.			1606	Stoop, Charles			
1523	Shaw, Robert				1607	Sturman, Samuel			
1524	Smith, Joseph				1608	Sturgeson, William			
1525	Smith, Robert				1609	Smyth, Thomas			
1526	Smith, Charles				1610	Smith, John			
1527	Stephens, William				1611	Smyth, Edward			
1528	Scott, Samuel	27 Oct.			1612	Smith, Henry			
1529	Temple, James				1613	Smith, Henry			
1530	Smyth, Robert				1614	Smith, Richard			
1531	Smyth, Ambrose				1615	Smith, Robert			
1532	Smyth, Francis				1616	Stony, William			
1533	Smyth, Charles				1617	Stokes, William			
1534	Smyth, Daniel				1618	Stephens, Thomas			
1535	Smyth, Thomas				1619	Stradala, Henry			
1536	Stephenson, Michael				1620	Strotton, Samuel			
1537	Stasley, John				1621	Sturman, John			
1538	Stewart, John				1622	Stewart, Richard			
1539	Strong, Charles				1623	Sturless, Bazozzo	1 Nov.		
1540	Szaz, William				1624	Surgon, Henry			
1541	Scott, David	29 Oct.			1625	Scott, Hapton			
1542	Scott, John				1626	Scotlet, John			
1543	Scapple, John, Jun.				1627	St. George, Archibald			
1544	Shaw, William J.				1628	Shaw, John			
1545	Shaw, Arthur				1629	Shaw, William			
1546	Shaw, Sir Robert				1630	Shaw, Bernard			
1547	Shaw, John				1631	Shaw, William			
1548	Shaw, Everett				1632	Shaw, John T.			
1549	Shaw, Ralph				1633	Shaw, James			
1550	Shaw, Thomas				1634	Shaw, Neil			
1551	Shaw, Thomas H.				1635	Shaw, Robert			
1552	Singleton, Benjamin				1636	Stephens, Henry E.			
1553	Singleton, William				1637	Strong, George			
1554	Smith, William				1638	Stroker, William			
1555	Smyth, Casse				1639	Sturgeson, Thomas			
1556	Smith, Richard				1640	Stephens, William			
1557	Smyth, Robert				1641	Strong, Joseph			
1558	Smith, Michael				1642	Sturgeson, William			

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.
	1899—continued.					1899—continued.			
1643	Shaw, Hans	1 Nov.			1197	Taylor, Edward	25 Oct.		
1644	Shay, William	—			1198	Thomas, John	—		
1645	Shaw, James	—			1199	Thomson, Thomas J.	30 Oct.		
1646	Shaw, William	—			1200	Thompson, John	—		
1647	Shaw, Henry C.	—			1201	Togg, Paul	27 Oct.		
1648	Shaw, Francis	—			1202	Thompson, Frederick	—		
1649	Shepherd, Hugh	2 Nov.			1203	Turo, Thomas	20 Oct.		
1650	Shaw, Benjamin J.	—			1204	Thompson, Samuel	—		
1651	Shaw, William	—			1205	Tier, Robert	—		
1652	Shaw, William	—			1206	Tomlinson, William	—		
1653	Shaw, Edward	—			1207	Toulson, Robert	—		
1654	Shaw, Arthur	—			1208	Turlington, Richardson	—		
1655	Shaw, Edward, jun.	—			1209	Tyner, Timothy	—		
1656	Shaw, William S.	—			1210	Tutill, William	—		
1657	Shaw, Richard	—			1211	Tyndal, Thomas	—		
1658	Shaw, Richard	3 Nov.			1212	Tyndal, S. W.	30 Oct.		
1659	Shaw, Wm. Evans	—			1213	Tyner, Richard	—		
1660	Shaw, Haynes W.	—			1214	Turlington, Charles	—		
1661	Shaw, John	—			1215	Tyler, Thomas	—		
1662	Shaw, William	—			1216	Thorp, Daniel	—		
1663	Shaw, Robert	—			1217	Tate, Alexander	—		
1664	Shaw, Edward	—			1218	Taylor, Paul	—		
1665	Shaw, John	—			1219	Taylor, De-pard	—		
1666	Shaw, William	—			1220	Talor, John	21 Oct.		
1667	Shaw, Richard	—			1221	Todd, John	—		
1668	Shaw, John	—			1222	Thorne, Uppas	—		
1669	Shaw, David Wm.	—			1223	Thompson, Joseph	—		
1670	Shaw, George	—			1224	Thompson, Joseph	—		
1671	Shaw, John	5 Nov.			1225	Thomas, Robert	—		
1672	Shaw, William	—			1226	Thomas, Robert	—		
1673	Shaw, Joseph	—			1227	Taylor, Alfred	—		
1674	Shaw, William	—			1228	Thomas, Louis	—		
1675	Shaw, Samuel	—			1229	Thomas, Henry	—		
1676	Shaw, Samuel	—			1230	Tycho, Joseph	—		
1677	Shaw, John	—			1231	Taylor, William	1 Nov.		
1678	Shaw, Edward	—			1232	Thompson, William	—		
1679	Shaw, William	—			1233	Thomas, Oliver A.	—		
1680	Shaw, John	—			1234	Tickell, George	—		
1681	Shaw, James	—			1235	Turlington, John	—		
1682	Shaw, Thomas	—			1236	Tycho, Alexander	—		
1683	Shaw, Edward	—			1237	Tackberry, Robert	5 Nov.		
1684	Shaw, Joseph	—			1238	Town, Hugh	—		
1685	Shaw, Robert	10 Oct.	19 Sept.		1239	Thompson, Robert	10 Oct.	30 Sept.	
1686	Shaw, Thomas	—			1240	Thorp, Charles	—		
1687	Shaw, John	—			1241	Todd, Arthur	—		
1688	Shaw, William	—			1242	Tud, William	3 Nov.		
1689	Shaw, James	—			1243	Thompson, William	—		
1690	Shaw, Thomas	6 Nov.			1244	Thorp, Gabriel	—		
1691	Shaw, Henry	—			1245	Thompson, William	—		
1692	Shaw, George	—			1246	Taylor, Robert	—		
1693	Shaw, John	—			1247	Taylor, Thomas	—		
1694	Shaw, Robert	—			1248	Tain, John	—		
1695	Shaw, William	—			1249	Thomson, Peter	—		
1696	Shaw, Richard	—			1250	Thompson, John	—		
1697	Shaw, John	—			1251	Tandy, John	—		
1698	Shaw, William	—			1252	Taylor, William	5 Nov.		
1699	Shaw, Charles	—			1253	Taylor, William, jun.	—		
1700	Sargeant, John P.	7 Nov.			1254	Tickell, George	—		
1701	Scott, Robert	—			1255	Thompson, Edward	—		
1702	Scott, James	—			1256	Taylor, Clement	—		
1703	Scott, William	—			1257	Thorp, John	6 Nov.		
1704	Scott, Richard	—			1258	Tarford, John	—		
1705	Sparks, Richard Wm.	—			1259	Tyrrel, James	—		
1706	Stock, Joseph	—			1260	Thomas, William N.	7 Nov.		
1707	Stevens, Samuel	8 Nov.			1261	Thomas, John	—		
1708	Stev, John	—			1262	Turlington, Joseph	—		
1709	Stev, John	—			1263	Thomas, Patrick	—		
1710	Stevenson, Thomas Ben.	—			1264	Thomas, Hon. Robert	—		
1711	Stith, Charles	—			1265	Thomas, William	8 Nov.		
1712	Spotwood, Ch.	9 Nov.			1266	Town, John	—		
1713	Stephens, John	—			1267	Thomas, Dudley	—		
1714	Stanley, Joseph	—			1268	Thomas, John	30 Nov.		
1715	Stewart, John F.	10 Nov.			1269	Turlington, Arthur	—		
1716	Stevens, William	12 Nov.			1270	Thomas, Rev. Wm. K.	12 Nov.		
1717	Stevens, Robert	—			1271	Thomas, James	—		
1718	Sheppard, Charles	14 Nov.			1272	Thorp, George	—		
1719	Smith, Francis	—			1273	Underwood, William	5 Nov.		
1720	Smith, Samuel	—			1274	Underwood, James	—		
1721	Smith, Henry	—			1275	Usher, John	—		
1722	Taylor, John K.	23 Oct.			1276	Vance, John	27 Oct.		
1723	Tins, Richard W.	24 Oct.			1277	Vardon, Edward	21 Oct.		
1724	Trench, Arthur	25 Oct.			1278	Vicker, John	—		
1725	Taylor, Thomas	—			1279	Veedohyle, John	—		
1726	Taylor, John	—			1280	Voss, Thomas	—		

(continued)

APPENDIX TO REPORT FROM THE

170]

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.
1828—continued.					1828—continued.				
1811	Vasser, George	1 Nov.			1895	West, Henry	2 Nov.		
1812	Vasser, John	2 Nov.			1896	Whistler, Gabriel			
1813	Vaughan, John				1897	White, John			
1814	Vere, Thomas	5 Nov.			1898	Wilson, John			
1815	Vesey, Rev. George	6 Nov.			1899	Wilson, James			
1816	Vero, William	13 Nov.			1900	Woodroffe, James			
1817	White, Joseph	23 Oct.			1901	Williams, John D.	3 Nov.		
1818	Wilson, William				1902	Wright, John			
1819	Waller, Thomas	24 Oct.			1903	Wharton, William			
1820	Warren, Samuel	25 Oct.			1904	White, Robert			
1821	Wheat, William				1905	Woodroffe, Joseph			
1822	Woods, Isaac				1906	Walker, John			
1823	Idem - ditto	Jan.			1907	Warren, Joseph			
1824	Waddell, John	26 Oct.			1908	White, William			
1825	Wright, William				1909	Wahl, John			
1826	Whithead, William				1910	Walker, Frederick			
1827	White, George Henry				1911	Whitman, Robert			
1828	Williams, William				1912	Whitehead, Thomas			
1829	Walker, James H.	27 Oct.			1913	Whitehead, George			
1830	Wahl, James				1914	White, William	5 Nov.		
1831	Warren, Peter				1915	White, Thomas			
1832	Warren, John E.				1916	Williams, Robert			
1833	Ward, William R.				1917	Walker, James			
1834	Ward, Elyse				1918	Wills, Anthony			
1835	Wheeler, John				1919	Wilkinson, James			
1836	White, Thomas J.				1920	West, Joseph			
1837	Wills, Major John				1921	Wickham, James			
1838	Warren, Thomas Wm.	29 Oct.			1922	Wright, Richard			
1839	Wharton, John				1923	Wyber, John			
1840	White, Richard, jun.				1924	Williams, Charles			
1841	White, James				1925	White, John J.			
1842	Wid, William				1926	Williams, Solomon			
1843	Williams, Henry				1927	Wright, George	6 Nov.		
1844	Wood, William				1928	Winstone, Thomas		10 Oct.	19 Sept.
1845	Wolf, William				1929	White, William			
1846	Worthington, Benford				1930	Wilkinson, William			
1847	Wells, John	30 Oct.			1931	Williams, John			
1848	Whately, Thomas				1932	Willard, Robert			
1849	Whitcomb, James				1933	Westly, William	7 Nov.		
1850	Whitstone, George Thos.				1934	Worby, Rev. Henry H. J.			
1851	Williams, Isaac T.				1935	Winkerson, Henry			
1852	Williams, Thomas		10 Oct.	19 Sept.	1936	Wheat, John			
1853	Williams, Thomas				1937	Wilkinson, Geo. jun.			
1854	Wilford, Geo. Wm.				1938	Wright, Paul			
1855	Williams, John				1939	Whitstone, William	8 Nov.		
1856	Williams, Richard				1940	Wilson, Robinson	10 Nov.		
1857	Williams, Edward H.				1941	Ward, Henry			
1858	Wright, William				1942	Webster, James			
1859	Watkins, Samuel	31 Oct.			1943	Wicks, William	12 Nov.		
1860	Woolhol, Samuel				1944	Wells, John			
1861	Went, Lewis				1945	Whistler, Gabriel	13 Nov.		
1862	Whitby, Charles				1946	Whitcomb, Gordon			
1863	White, Richard				1947	Wharton, John L.	14 Nov.		
1864	Whitaker, George				1948	Wilkinson, William			
1865	Wills, Rev. Samuel				1949	West, John	15 Nov.		
1866	Wilson, David				1950	Williams, Henry	16 Nov.		
1867	William, John				1951	Young, Joseph	31 Oct.		
1868	Williams, William				1952	Young, Samuel			
1869	Williams, Thomas				1953	Young, William			
1870	Wildridge, William				1954	Yates, Richard, jun.	2 Oct.		
1871	Wilson, John				1955	Young, Robert S.	5 Oct.		
1872	Wilson, Thomas				1956	Yates, Kendrick			
1873	Wood, Robert W.				1957	Yates, George	5 Nov.		
1874	Wood, John				1958	Young, Richard M.			
1875	Wade, John	1 Nov.			1959	Young, John	8 Nov.		
1876	Wall, Richard H.				1960	Young, William	15 Nov.		
1877	Wall, Jarvis				1950:				
1878	Warren, John				1961	Abbott, Thomas, jun.	4 Feb.	4 Feb.	14 Jan.
1879	Whitford, George				1962	Alcock, Stephen	5 Aug.	5 Aug.	15 July
1880	Wiler, Charles				1963	Barker, Richard	4 Feb.	4 Feb.	14 Jan.
1881	Wills, James				1964	Biskaly, Michael R.	4 Nov.	5 Nov.	14 Oct.
1882	Williams, Benjamin				1965	Boyd, John			
1883	Wills, Thomas				1966	Connelly, Thomas			
1884	Wood, William				1967	Cheswell, John			
1885	Worthington, Alexander				1968	Farago, Henry	5 Aug.	5 Aug.	15 July
1886	Wright, Samuel				1969	Kelly, Edward			
1887	Wyne, Edward				1970	Reilly, William Maxwell	4 Feb.	4 Feb.	14 Jan.
1888	Walker, William	2 Nov.			1971	Sweeney, Walters E.	5 Feb.		
1889	Walsk, William				1972	Tee, George	6 May	6 May	15 April
1890	Walls, George				1973	Turner, John Francis			
1891	Walplate, Samuel				1854:				
1892	White, Thomas W.				1974	Boorse, Peter	5 Feb.	5 Feb.	15 Jan.
1893	Watson, Joseph								
1894	West, Jacob								

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[371

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.
1834—continued					1835—continued.				
1973	Boone, James, Junr.	5 May	5 May	14 Apr.	5067	Dickson, Robert	5 Feb.	2 Feb.	29 Jan.
1976	Brooks, John	3 Feb.	3 Feb.	13 Jan.	5035	Diggs, Henry	12 Feb.	—	—
1977	McCreadon, John	—	—	—	5059	Dobbs, Thomas	6 May	4 May	13 Apr.
1978	McCreadon, Richard B.	—	—	—	5069	Dobbs, Edward	7 May	—	—
1979	Magill, George	—	—	—	5021	Dorrick, John	9 May	—	—
1980	Malton, John	—	—	—	5082	Douchon, Robert	11 May	—	—
1981	Reckford, William	3 Nov.	3 Nov.	13 Oct.	5053	Doyle, David	12 May	—	—
1982	Rams, Isaac	5 May	5 May	14 Apr.	5054	Doy, Robert	13 May	—	—
1983	Woods, James	3 Feb.	3 Feb.	13 Jan.	5025	Downs, Josh.	12 May	—	—
1984	Whitford, T. E.	5 May	5 May	14 Apr.	5056	Davis, John	25 May	—	—
					5057	Deake, Francis	1 June	—	—
					5058	Deane, John	—	—	—
1985	Aubler, F. M.	2 Feb.	2 Feb.	12 Jan.	5059	Deary, William E.	2 June	—	—
1986	Arthur, John	4 Feb.	—	—	5070	Deary, Hugh	—	—	—
1987	Armstrong, Edward	4 May	4 May	13 Apr.	5071	Deary, John	10 June	—	—
1988	Ashley, Anthony	—	—	—	5072	Dwyer, Francis	3 Aug.	5 Aug.	18 July
1989	Allen, James	—	—	—	5073	Dight, Richard	2 Nov.	2 Nov.	25 Oct.
1990	Anderson, Edward	—	—	—	5074	Duncan, James F.	—	—	—
1991	Anderson, John	—	—	—	5075	Dobbin, David	4 Nov.	—	—
1992	Arma, Rev. Gilbert	6 May	—	—	5076	Duncan, Nugent	—	—	—
1993	Askeown, William	2 June	—	—	5077	Egan, James	4 Feb.	2 Feb.	12 Jan.
1994	Atkinson, George	—	—	—	5078	Edward, Wilson	—	—	—
1995	Armit, Richard	15 June	—	—	5079	Eades, Richard	18 May	4 May	13 Apr.
1996	Acheson, Alexander	5 Aug.	3 Aug.	23 July	5080	Evans, George	12 Nov.	2 Nov.	19 Oct.
1997	Asham, Charles	3 Nov.	2 Nov.	22 Oct.	5081	Feld, James	3 Feb.	2 Feb.	12 Jan.
1998	Adams, William O'Brien	4 Nov.	—	—	5082	Fitzpatrick, Matthew	6 Feb.	—	—
1999	Asquith, Oliver	14 Nov.	—	—	5083	Fisher, Henry William	7 Feb.	—	—
2000	Allen, Robert	25 Nov.	—	—	5084	Fitzgerald, Charles	9 Feb.	—	—
2001	Banister, Richard	2 Feb.	2 Feb.	12 Jan.	5085	Frost, John William	12 Feb.	—	—
2002	Balfour, John Y.	5 Feb.	—	—	5086	Furman, Norbury	5 May	3 May	13 Apr.
2003	Baldy, Lazar	6 Feb.	—	—	5087	Ford, George	7 May	—	—
2004	Black, John B.	4 May	4 May	13 Apr.	5088	Foida, John Sewell	19 May	—	—
2005	Bolton, Thomas	—	—	—	5089	Francis, James	1 June	—	—
2006	Baksey, Robert	5 May	—	—	5090	Francis, Thomas	2 June	—	—
2007	Beave, Daniel Francis	—	—	—	5091	Francis, Montgomery	—	—	—
2008	Broadell, John D.	—	—	—	5092	Fry, Thomas	—	—	—
2009	Borch, Nadra	7 May	—	—	5093	Forbes, Arthur	—	—	—
2010	Borras, John	15 May	—	—	5094	Fry, John	5 June	—	—
2011	Bosman, Joseph	19 May	—	—	5095	Fry, Mary Lawrence	—	—	—
2012	Brice, Joseph	21 May	—	—	5096	Fry, William	11 June	2 Feb.	12 Jan.
2013	Brown, Hesterbery	1 June	—	—	5097	Graess, Henry	2 Feb.	—	—
2014	Brown, Duncro	3 June	—	—	5098	Grigg, Robert	—	—	—
2015	Burry, Henry	4 June	—	—	5099	Gregory, William	5 Feb.	—	—
2016	Browning, Thomas	5 June	—	—	5100	Graess, William	9 Feb.	—	—
2017	Boss, Richard	9 June	—	—	5101	Graham, John	12 Feb.	—	—
2018	Bradford, Benjamin	—	—	—	5102	Gray, Samuel Nelson	6 May	4 May	13 Apr.
2019	Barrow, Thomas D.	10 June	—	—	5103	Goodall, Abraham	25 May	—	—
2020	Byrne, Thomas	4 Aug.	3 Aug.	13 July	5104	Graess, Robert	3 June	—	—
2021	Bernett, Edward	—	—	—	5105	Graess, William	—	—	—
2022	Boucher, Henry	5 Aug.	—	—	5106	Graess, Robert Thomas	—	—	—
2023	Bh-A. R. S.	—	—	—	5107	Graess, Alexander	—	—	—
2024	Betham, M. C.	6 Aug.	—	—	5108	Graham, William	5 June	—	—
2025	Bignall, Jonathan	19 Aug.	—	—	5109	Gray, John	4 June	—	—
2026	Bolger, Charles	3 Nov.	2 Nov.	18 Oct.	5110	Graess, Henry	5 June	—	—
2027	Black, Rev. Gibson	6 Nov.	—	—	5111	Graess, John	6 June	—	—
2028	Barnes, John	10 Nov.	—	—	5112	Grady, David	4 Aug.	—	—
2029	Borras, Hugh	12 Nov.	—	—	5113	Grady, Joseph	5 Aug.	—	—
2030	Christina, Thomas R.	4 Feb.	2 Feb.	12 Jan.	5114	Graess, James	3 Aug.	—	—
2031	Christina, William	—	—	—	5115	Gray, William	18 Aug.	8 Nov.	21 Oct.
2032	Covehill, Thomas	10 Feb.	—	—	5116	Gilmore, John	8 Nov.	5 Feb.	12 Jan.
2033	Cockburn, Peter	13 Feb.	—	—	5117	Higginbotham, Robert	5 Feb.	—	—
2034	Cox, Joseph	4 May	4 May	13 Apr.	5118	Hovison, William	—	—	—
2035	Cooper, Henry	9 May	—	—	5119	Holmes, George	—	—	—
2036	Craikes, Christopher	—	—	—	5120	Hart, John	13 Feb.	4 May	12 Apr.
2037	Crawford, James	—	—	—	5121	Hart, Thomas	5 May	—	—
2038	Coyle, William	11 May	—	—	5122	Hartwell, William	6 May	—	—
2039	Curran, William	12 May	—	—	5123	Hartwell, Henry Stanley	—	—	—
2040	Daids, Edward	18 May	—	—	5124	Hewson, Charles	7 May	—	—
2041	Callow, James	20 May	—	—	5125	Humphry, Alexander	9 May	—	—
2042	Cotton, Thomas	25 May	—	—	5126	Hart, Rev. G. B.	—	—	—
2043	Carroll, Frederick	30 May	—	—	5127	Hodges, William	14 May	—	—
2044	Censor, Benjamin	1 June	—	—	5128	Hobbs, William	—	—	—
2045	Cooper, William	2 June	—	—	5129	Hugh, William	18 May	—	—
2046	Coll, John	6 June	—	—	5130	Hansen, Francis, Junr.	16 May	—	—
2047	Cross, William	9 June	—	—	5131	Howard, Thomas Bentley	29 May	—	—
2048	Cooper, Henry	11 June	—	—	5132	Hunt, Henry	30 May	—	—
2049	Cooper, Thomas	12 June	—	—	5133	Hyle, Francis	—	—	—
2050	O'Connell, Daniel	4 Aug.	3 Aug.	13 July	5134	Higginson, Henry	1 June	—	—
2051	Clarke, Peter Rose	6 Aug.	—	—	5135	Holmes, Thomas	—	—	—
2052	Crofton, Samuel	7 Aug.	—	—	5136	Hill, Richard	3 June	—	—
2053	Culler, William	8 Nov.	2 Nov.	12 Oct.	5137	Holmes, Rev. H. R.	—	—	—
2054	Cookson, Francis	23 Nov.	—	—	5138	Hart, Patrick	—	—	—
2055	Dixon, William	4 Feb.	2 Feb.	12 Jan.	5139	Hart, Joseph	—	—	—
2056	Dwyer, Robert	—	—	—	5140	Hart, William S.	—	—	—

(continued)

APPENDIX TO REPORT FROM THE

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.
1855—continued.					1855—continued.				
2141	Barnes, Roger	2 June	4 May	18 April	2245	Maley, Charles	22 May	4 May	10 April
2142	Barnes, James	—	—	—	2246	McNabb, Samuel	1 June	—	—
2143	Bayer, John	5 June	—	—	2247	McMillan, John	8 June	—	—
2144	Beattie, Rev. G. A.	4 June	—	—	2248	Moore, Rev. John Lewis	—	—	—
2145	Ballmore, R. C. H.	5 June	—	—	2249	McDonnell, William	—	—	—
2146	Ballin, William	4 Aug.	3 Aug.	13 July	2250	Mason, Edward Andrew	—	—	—
2147	Hughes, Alexander	—	—	—	2251	Mooney, William	—	—	—
2148	Hughes, John	—	—	—	2252	Magrath, Marcus	—	—	—
2149	Hays, William A.	7 Aug.	—	—	2253	Maguire, Alexander	3 June	—	—
2150	Hawbridge, John	10 Aug.	—	—	2254	Mason, Arthur Wellesley	—	—	—
2151	Haw, Joseph	10 Aug.	—	—	2255	McIlken, John	4 June	—	—
2152	Hemilton, Francis, jun.	20 Aug.	—	—	2256	McInnis, Henry	—	—	—
2153	Henchy, Douglas	2 Nov.	2 Nov.	13 Oct.	2257	McIntosh, William	5 June	—	—
2154	Hendlin, Chas. William	4 Nov.	—	—	2258	McIntyre, John	—	—	—
2155	Hendlin, Christopher	9 Nov.	—	—	2259	McIntyre, Richard	9 June	—	—
2156	Henderson, Thomas	17 Nov.	—	—	2260	McIntyre, Adam	10 June	—	—
2157	Henry, John	5 Feb.	2 Feb.	12 Jan.	2261	McIntyre, John	10 June	3 Aug.	12 July
2158	Johnston, Alexander	6 Feb.	—	—	2262	McIntyre, William David	6 Aug.	—	—
2159	Henry, George	4 Feb.	—	—	2263	McIntyre, Joseph	10 Aug.	—	—
2160	Henry, Hugh	—	—	—	2264	McIntyre, William	—	—	—
2161	Irwin, Rev. A.	11 Feb.	—	—	2265	McIntyre, Marcus Samuel	—	—	—
2162	Johnson, Charles F.	20 Feb.	—	—	2266	McIntyre, George	11 Aug.	9 Nov.	19 Oct.
2163	Joan, John	—	—	—	2267	Miller, Thomas	11 Nov.	—	—
2164	Joan, James	—	—	—	2268	McCarthy, Thomas	16 Nov.	—	—
2165	Johnston, William	2 June	4 May	15 April	2269	McCarthy, Henry	—	—	—
2166	Joan, Nathaniel	—	—	—	2270	McCarthy, Thomas B.	—	—	—
2167	Joan, William	4 June	—	—	2271	McCarthy, Richard	17 Nov.	—	—
2168	Jackson, John	—	—	—	2272	McCarthy, Stephen	18 Nov.	—	—
2169	Johnson, William	—	—	—	2273	McCarthy, Fred. William	20 Nov.	—	—
2170	Johnson, the Hon. William	6 June	—	—	2274	McCarthy, John	25 Nov.	—	—
2171	Johnson, George	6 Aug.	3 Aug.	13 July	2275	McCarthy, William	16 Feb.	6 Feb.	12 Jan.
2172	Joan, Arthur	3 Nov.	2 Nov.	10 Oct.	2276	McCarthy, Edward	11 May	4 May	15 April
2173	Kelly, John	4 Feb.	2 Feb.	18 Jan.	2277	McCarthy, Rev. Edmund	14 May	—	—
2174	Kelly, William	5 Feb.	—	—	2278	McCarthy, John William	18 May	—	—
2175	Kearney, William	—	—	—	2279	McCarthy, Richard	5 June	—	—
2176	Kearney, James M.	8 May	4 May	13 April	2280	McCarthy, Francis	—	—	—
2177	Kearney, Henry	9 May	—	—	2281	McCarthy, Alexander	—	—	—
2178	Kearney, Patrick	16 May	—	—	2282	McCarthy, Rev. Thomas	4 June	—	—
2179	Kearney, John	21 May	—	—	2283	McCarthy, Robert	—	—	—
2180	Kearney, Thomas	26 May	—	—	2284	McCarthy, Rev. James	5 June	—	—
2181	Kearney, William	1 June	—	—	2285	McCarthy, Henry	11 June	—	—
2182	Kearney, John	3 June	—	—	2286	McCarthy, Robert	4 Feb.	2 Feb.	18 Jan.
2183	Kearney, James Birch	—	—	—	2287	McCarthy, Richard, jun.	10 Feb.	—	—
2184	Kearney, James Brett	—	—	—	2288	O'Hara, Robert	13 May	4 May	15 April
2185	Kearney, John	—	—	—	2289	O'Hara, William	—	—	—
2186	Kelly, Rev. George	11 June	—	—	2290	O'Hara, John	4 June	—	—
2187	Kemp, Richard	5 Aug.	3 Aug.	15 July	2291	O'Hara, John	12 Aug.	3 Aug.	15 July
2188	Kerrison, Benjamin	—	—	—	2292	O'Connor, Rev. George Wm.	12 Nov.	2 Nov.	10 Oct.
2189	Kerrison, Charles	—	—	—	2293	O'Connor, David Thomas	4 Feb.	9 Feb.	18 Jan.
2190	Kerrison, Henry	4 Aug.	—	—	2294	Pala, Henry	5 Feb.	—	—
2191	Kerrison, Fred. Edward	6 Aug.	—	—	2295	Pattison, James	7 Feb.	—	—
2192	Kerrison, Robert	4 Feb.	2 Feb.	18 Jan.	2296	Pattison, John	19 May	4 May	15 April
2193	Keane, David Daniel	5 Feb.	—	—	2297	Pattison, Richard	20 May	—	—
2194	Keane, Henry Wallace	4 May	4 May	15 April	2298	Pattison, John	20 May	—	—
2195	Keane, John	11 May	—	—	2299	Pattison, Wm. Patrick	20 May	—	—
2196	Keane, Henry	—	—	—	2300	Pickering, Charles	1 June	—	—
2197	Keane, Peter Digges	22 May	—	—	2301	Pierce, James	4 June	—	—
2198	Keane, Edw. Hayes	1 June	—	—	2302	Payton, Geo. Hamilton	5 June	—	—
2199	Keane, Joseph	—	—	—	2303	Payton, Stephen	15 Aug.	3 Aug.	15 July
2200	Keane, Samuel	4 June	—	—	2304	Payton, William	—	—	—
2201	Keane, John	—	—	—	2305	Payton, Samuel, jun.	5 Nov.	2 Nov.	10 Oct.
2202	Keane, William	—	—	—	2306	Payton, John	5 Feb.	2 Feb.	18 Jan.
2203	Keane, Christian Henry	11 June	—	—	2307	Payton, William	—	—	—
2204	Keane, Hugh	5 Aug.	3 Aug.	15 July	2308	Payton, Charles	12 May	4 May	15 April
2205	Keane, Robert	4 Nov.	2 Nov.	10 Oct.	2309	Payton, John	20 May	—	—
2206	Keane, Matthew	7 Nov.	—	—	2310	Payton, George	4 June	—	—
2207	Le Bon, James	21 Nov.	—	—	2311	Payton, George	3 Aug.	3 Aug.	15 July
2208	McBurn, Ralph	5 Feb.	2 Feb.	12 Jan.	2312	Payton, Peter	7 Aug.	—	—
2209	McBurn, Joseph	4 Feb.	—	—	2313	Payton, Edward St. G.	19 Aug.	—	—
2210	Murphy, Edward William	5 Feb.	—	—	2314	Payton, Thomas	29 Nov.	2 Nov.	10 Oct.
2211	McBurn, John	—	—	—	2315	Payton, William	21 Nov.	—	—
2212	McBurn, George	—	—	—	2316	Payton, Henry Shields	2 Feb.	2 Feb.	18 Jan.
2213	McBurn, Thomas	5 Feb.	—	—	2317	Payton, Henry	5 Feb.	—	—
2214	McCullagh, James	—	—	—	2318	Payton, William	6 Feb.	—	—
2215	McMahon, Humphrey	7 Feb.	—	—	2319	Payton, Abraham W.	9 Feb.	—	—
2216	McCleary, David, jun.	9 Feb.	—	—	2320	Payton, Alderman St. W.	10 Feb.	—	—
2217	McCarthy, Henry	—	—	—	2321	Payton, Charles Ferdinand	12 Feb.	—	—
2218	McCarthy, John Frederick	10 Feb.	—	—	2322	Payton, William	6 May	4 May	15 April
2219	McCarthy, John	15 Feb.	—	—					
2220	Moore, John	5 May	4 May	13 April					
2221	Murray, Patrick	7 May	—	—					
2222	McMahon, Andrew	18 May	—	—					
2223	McMahon, John	21 May	—	—					
2224	McGee, James	25 May	—	—					

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.
1815—continued.									
2500	Stevens, Alexander	19 May	4 May	19 April	2509	Stokken, George	14 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July
2501	Stibbe, John	20 May	—	—	2510	Stoy, Adam	17 Aug.	—	—
2511	Stokkops, Henry	—	—	—	2511	Stowell, James Joseph	7 Nov.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.
2512	Stogson, Alexander	29 May	—	—	2512	Studdy, John	—	—	—
2513	Stoth, Richard	2 June	—	—	2513	Studdy, Henry, jun.	—	—	—
2514	Stout, George	—	—	—	2514	Stuyvesant, Bealy	11 Nov.	—	—
2515	Stoutson, John	3 June	—	—	2515	Styler, Walter	12 Nov.	—	—
2516	Stouty, Hugh Benford	—	—	—	2516	Styler, John W.	14 Nov.	—	—
2517	Sturany, John	—	—	—	2517	Styler, Edward Robert	—	—	—
2518	Stutz, Frederick	—	—	—	2518	Styler, Robert	15 Nov.	—	—
2519	Stutson, Edward Rowell	4 June	—	—	2519	Styler, Matthew H.	17 Nov.	—	—
2520	Stutson, Charles	—	—	—	2520	Styler, Edward	19 Nov.	—	—
2521	Stutson, Nicholas	—	—	—	2521	Styler, John	21 Nov.	—	—
2522	Stutz, Robert	5 June	—	—	2522	Styler, Henry	—	—	—
2523	Stutwood, Oliver Eaton	5 June	—	—	2523	Styler, John	24 Nov.	—	—
2524	Stutwood, Thomas	10 June	—	—	2524	Styler, George	—	—	—
2525	Stutz, William	15 June	—	—	2525	Styler, John, Sherwood	28 Nov.	—	—
2526	Stutz, John Pearson	—	—	—	2526	Styler, Frederick	12 Feb.	1 Feb.	11 Jan.
2527	Stutz, Richard	—	—	—	2527	Styler, David	17 Feb.	—	—
2528	Stutz, William O'Brien	6 Aug.	3 Aug.	13 July	2528	Styler, Joseph	19 Feb.	—	—
2529	Stutz, Thomas	14 Aug.	—	—	2529	Styler, Isaac	20 Feb.	—	—
2530	Stutzman, Thomas Lewis	21 Aug.	—	—	2530	Styler, John	1 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July
2531	Stutzer, William	13 Nov.	9 Nov.	11 Oct.	2531	Styler, James	11 Aug.	—	—
2532	Stutz, James	13 Nov.	—	—	2532	Styler, James	15 Aug.	—	—
2533	Stutz, Francis	17 Nov.	—	—	2533	Styler, Joseph	7 Nov.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.
2534	Stutz, James	19 Nov.	—	—	2534	Styler, George	—	—	—
2535	Taylor, Joseph	5 Feb.	2 Feb.	12 Jan.	2535	Styler, George	—	—	—
2536	Taylor, Daniel George	—	—	—	2536	Styler, George	—	—	—
2537	Talbot, Maloro H.	6 Feb.	—	—	2537	Styler, George	—	—	—
2538	Thompson, Robert	25 May	4 May	15 April	2538	Styler, George	—	—	—
2539	Trey, George Richard	9 June	—	—	2539	Styler, George	—	—	—
2540	Tracy, James Phillips	6 June	—	—	2540	Styler, George	—	—	—
2541	Truelock, Samuel	15 June	—	—	2541	Styler, George	—	—	—
2542	Trycross, George	5 Aug.	5 Aug.	25 July	2542	Styler, George	—	—	—
2543	Trycross, Edward	—	—	—	2543	Styler, George	—	—	—
2544	Thomas, Evan Phillips	19 Aug.	—	—	2544	Styler, George	—	—	—
2545	Usher, William	19 May	4 May	15 April	2545	Styler, George	—	—	—
2546	Usher, Richard Beverly	9 June	—	—	2546	Styler, George	—	—	—
2547	Usack, George	2 June	—	—	2547	Styler, George	—	—	—
2548	Vandenberg, Berthelosew	4 Nov.	2 Nov.	12 Oct.	2548	Styler, George	—	—	—
2549	Wales, Sir Thomas	4 Feb.	2 Feb.	12 Jan.	2549	Styler, George	—	—	—
2550	Wilson, James	—	—	—	2550	Styler, George	—	—	—
2551	Williams, George	5 Feb.	—	—	2551	Styler, George	—	—	—
2552	Whitson, William	15 Feb.	—	—	2552	Styler, George	—	—	—
2553	Williams, Henry	4 May	4 May	15 April	2553	Styler, George	—	—	—
2554	Walker, David	18 May	—	—	2554	Styler, George	—	—	—
2555	Wanamoth, John	10 May	—	—	2555	Styler, George	—	—	—
2556	Weston, William	11 May	—	—	2556	Styler, George	—	—	—
2557	Wilson, John	20 May	—	—	2557	Styler, George	—	—	—
2558	Wilson, Lodge	—	—	—	2558	Styler, George	—	—	—
2559	Wilson, Philip	8 June	—	—	2559	Styler, George	—	—	—
2560	Wolfe, James	—	—	—	2560	Styler, George	—	—	—
2561	Wilson, Thomas	—	—	—	2561	Styler, George	—	—	—
2562	Winn, William	9 June	—	—	2562	Styler, George	—	—	—
2563	Williams, Richard	11 June	—	—	2563	Styler, George	—	—	—
2564	White, Rev. John	12 June	—	—	2564	Styler, George	—	—	—
2565	Wicks, Robert	13 June	—	—	2565	Styler, George	—	—	—
2566	Wick, William	9 Aug.	5 Aug.	12 July	2566	Styler, George	—	—	—
2567	Wick, George	9 Aug.	—	—	2567	Styler, George	—	—	—
2568	Wicks, Anthony	10 Aug.	—	—	2568	Styler, George	—	—	—
2569	Walker, John	11 Aug.	—	—	2569	Styler, George	—	—	—
2570	Wilson, Robert	13 Aug.	—	—	2570	Styler, George	—	—	—
2571	Wood, Robert Bell	21 Aug.	—	—	2571	Styler, George	—	—	—
2572	White, John Green	5 Nov.	9 Nov.	10 Oct.	2572	Styler, George	—	—	—
2573	Wilson, Robert	6 Nov.	—	—	2573	Styler, George	—	—	—
2574	West, William	12 Nov.	—	—	2574	Styler, George	—	—	—
2575	Woods, Isaac Hamilton	17 Nov.	—	—	2575	Styler, George	—	—	—
2576	Young, William Henry	22 Feb.	9 Feb.	19 Jan.	2576	Styler, George	—	—	—
2577	Young, Forbes	2 June	4 May.	15 April	2577	Styler, George	—	—	—
2578	Young, William	4 June	—	—	2578	Styler, George	—	—	—
2579	Young, James	18 Aug.	3 Aug.	23 July	2579	Styler, George	—	—	—
1856									
2580	Archer, George, jun.	1 Feb.	1 Feb.	11 Jan.	2580	Styler, George	—	—	—
2581	Anger, George	9 May	2 May	11 April	2581	Styler, George	—	—	—
2582	Alley, Charles	12 Nov.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.	2582	Styler, George	—	—	—
2583	Alcock, Edward Vign	15 Nov.	—	—	2583	Styler, George	—	—	—
2584	Anderson, Joshua W.	3 Dec.	—	—	2584	Styler, George	—	—	—
2585	Bell, David	4 Feb.	1 Feb.	11 Jan.	2585	Styler, George	—	—	—
2586	Buckley, Francis	11 Feb.	—	—	2586	Styler, George	—	—	—
2587	Brown, Thomas	15 Feb.	—	—	2587	Styler, George	—	—	—
2588	Bretcher, Edward	9 May	9 May	11 April	2588	Styler, George	—	—	—
2589	Bulger, George	4 May	—	—	2589	Styler, George	—	—	—
2590	Burt, Steward B.	5 May	—	—	2590	Styler, George	—	—	—
2591	Baker, John	8 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July	2591	Styler, George	—	—	—
1856—continued.									
2592	Baldwin, George	—	—	—	2592	Styler, George	—	—	—
2593	Baldwin, Adam	—	—	—	2593	Styler, George	—	—	—
2594	Baldwin, James Joseph	—	—	—	2594	Styler, George	—	—	—
2595	Baldwin, Henry, jun.	—	—	—	2595	Styler, George	—	—	—
2596	Baldwin, Bealy	—	—	—	2596	Styler, George	—	—	—
2597	Baldwin, Walter	—	—	—	2597	Styler, George	—	—	—
2598	Baldwin, John W.	—	—	—	2598	Styler, George	—	—	—
2599	Baldwin, Edward Robert	—	—	—	2599	Styler, George	—	—	—
2600	Baldwin, Robert	—	—	—	2600	Styler, George	—	—	—
2601	Baldwin, Matthew H.	—	—	—	2601	Styler, George	—	—	—
2602	Baldwin, Edward	—	—	—	2602	Styler, George	—	—	—
2603	Baldwin, John	—	—	—	2603	Styler, George	—	—	—
2604	Baldwin, Henry	—	—	—	2604	Styler, George	—	—	—
2605	Baldwin, John	—	—	—	2605	Styler, George	—	—	—
2606	Baldwin, Henry	—	—	—	2606	Styler, George	—	—	—
2607	Baldwin, Henry	—	—	—	2607	Styler, George	—	—	—
2608	Baldwin, Robert	—	—	—	2608	Styler, George	—	—	—
2609	Baldwin, George	—	—	—	2609	Styler, George	—	—	—
2610	Baldwin, John, Sherwood	—	—	—	2610	Styler, George	—	—	—
2611	Baldwin, Frederick	—	—	—	2611	Styler, George	—	—	—
2612	Baldwin, David	—	—	—	2612	Styler, George	—	—	—
2613	Baldwin, Joseph	—	—	—	2613	Styler, George	—	—	—
2614	Baldwin, Isaac	—	—	—	2614	Styler, George	—	—	—
2615	Baldwin, John	—	—	—	2615	Styler, George	—	—	—
2616	Baldwin, James	—	—	—	2616	Styler, George	—	—	—
2617	Baldwin, John	—	—	—	2617	Styler, George	—	—	—
2618	Baldwin, Thomas	—	—	—	2618	Styler, George	—	—	—
2619	Baldwin, John	—	—	—	2619	Styler, George	—	—	—
2620	Baldwin, James	—	—	—	2620	Styler, George	—	—	—
2621	Baldwin, Wm. Edward	—	—	—	2621	Styler, George	—	—	—
2622	Baldwin, Henry, Poet	—	—	—	2622	Styler, George	—	—	—
2623	Baldwin, Henry	—	—	—	2623	Styler, George	—	—	—
2624	Baldwin, Samuel	—	—	—	2624	Styler, George	—	—	—
2625	Baldwin, James	—	—	—	2625	Styler, George	—	—	—
2626	Baldwin, John	—	—	—	2626	Styler, George	—	—	—
2627	Baldwin, Robert	—	—	—	2627	Styler, George	—	—	—
2628	Baldwin, Robert	—	—	—	2628	Styler, George	—	—	—
2629	Baldwin, Robert	—	—	—	2629	Styler, George	—	—	—
2630	Baldwin, Robert	—	—	—	2630	Styler, George	—	—	—
2631	Baldwin, George	—	—	—	2631	Styler, George	—	—	—
2632	Baldwin, George	—	—	—	2632	Styler, George	—	—	—
2633	Baldwin, Charles	—	—	—	2633	Styler, George	—	—	—
2634	Baldwin, Charles	—	—	—	2634	Styler, George	—	—	—
2635	Baldwin, Charles	—	—	—	2635	Styler, George	—	—	—
2636	Baldwin, Charles	—	—	—	2636	Styler, George	—	—	—
2637	Baldwin, Charles	—	—	—	2637	Styler, George	—	—	—
2638	Baldwin, Charles	—	—	—	2638	Styler, George	—	—	—
2639	Baldwin, Charles	—	—	—	2639	Styler, George	—	—	—
2640	Baldwin, Charles	—	—	—					

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Session.	Date of Notice of Registry.
1836—continued.					1836—continued.				
2478	Bethington, George	3 May	9 May	11 Apr.	2550	Newton, James	16 Feb.	1 Feb.	11 Jan.
2477	Bomas, John	9 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July	2551	Newton, Joseph C.	4 May	2 May	11 Apr.
2479	Binghobson, Henry, jun.	9 Aug.	—	—	2552	Newcomb, William	24 May	—	—
2479	Birch, Robert	15 Aug.	—	—	2553	Nixon, Abraham	11 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July
2480	Byrdman, Charles	7 Nov.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.	2554	Nixon, Richard Lorenzo	—	—	—
2481	Hobson, Gustavus	14 Nov.	—	—	2555	Nixon, Robert Low	7 Nov.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.
2482	Hamilton, William Rowan	—	—	—	2556	Norton, William	6 Dec.	—	—
2483	Hasterville, William	—	—	—	2557	Norton, Reuben	10 Dec.	—	—
2484	Henderson, John	19 Nov.	—	—	2558	Oakley, William	4 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July
2485	Henderson, Richard	—	—	—	2559	Ogden, William	9 Aug.	—	—
2486	Henderson, Robert	—	—	—	2560	Ogden, Charles Montague	13 Aug.	—	—
2487	Hemilton, Bess Henry	24 Nov.	—	—	2561	Owens, Charles Coxy	14 Nov.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.
2488	Hemphill, James Armstrong	24 Nov.	—	—	2562	Oldham, William	20 Nov.	—	—
2489	Hess, Gilbert	24 Nov.	—	—	2563	O'Grady, Hon. Walter	20 Nov.	—	—
2490	Hepwood, George	29 Nov.	—	—	2564	O'Grady, Hon. Richard	—	—	—
2491	Hess, Joseph	—	—	—	2565	Price, William	1 Feb.	1 Feb.	11 Jan.
2492	Hess, John	1 Feb.	1 Feb.	11 Jan.	2566	Pike, Robert, jun.	2 Feb.	—	—
2493	Jesson, Frederick	10 Feb.	—	—	2567	Parker, Frederick St. Bury	16 May	9 May	11 Apr.
2494	Johnston, James	15 Feb.	—	—	2568	Parsons, Thomas	24 May	—	—
2495	Johnston, Francis	19 Feb.	—	—	2569	Palmer, Isaac	—	—	—
2496	Johnston, Henry	—	—	—	2570	Palmer George	—	—	—
2497	Jones, Thomas	2 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July	2571	Palmer, James Richard	—	—	—
2498	Jones, Richard	2 Aug.	—	—	2572	Parr, William	5 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July
2499	Johnston, Charles	9 Aug.	—	—	2573	Phelps, Thomas	15 Aug.	—	—
2500	Jones, John	—	—	—	2574	Parr, John James	10 Nov.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.
2501	Jervis, Isaac	15 Aug.	—	—	2575	Parrell, Peter	15 Nov.	—	—
2502	Jordan, Alexander	7 Nov.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.	2576	Parter, Samuel	21 Nov.	—	—
2503	Johnston, Nelson	10 Nov.	—	—	2577	Patton, John	22 Nov.	—	—
2504	Jones, William	12 Nov.	—	—	2578	Paterson, Thomas	—	—	—
2505	Jebson, Daniel	—	—	—	2579	Partison, Robert	—	—	—
2506	Irwin, Sandereson	15 Nov.	—	—	2580	Potts, James	24 Nov.	—	—
2507	Jones, James	17 Nov.	—	—	2581	Price, Thomas	29 Nov.	—	—
2508	Jones, Robert	18 Nov.	—	—	2582	Pierce, James	2 Dec.	—	—
2509	Irwin, Alexander	22 Nov.	—	—	2583	Quake, Robert	11 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July
2510	Johnston, Thomas	—	—	—	2584	Raid, Rev. James	4 Feb.	1 Feb.	11 Jan.
2511	Janet, Samuel	5 Dec.	—	—	2585	Raid, Henry	—	—	—
2512	Jackson, Joseph	—	—	—	2586	Rail, Robert	10 Feb.	—	—
2513	Kesley, William	20 Feb.	1 Feb.	11 Jan.	2587	Randall, William	24 May	6 May	11 Apr.
2514	Knight, Richard	15 May	4 May	11 Apr.	2588	Rogers, Thomas	3 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July
2515	Kendry, John Birch	14 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July	2589	Rosch, Robert	9 Aug.	—	—
2516	Kings, James	13 Aug.	—	—	2590	Roske, George	—	—	—
2517	Knox, Thomas	15 Aug.	—	—	2591	Ryan, Charles Coxy	14 Aug.	—	—
2518	Kennedy, Gilbert	19 Aug.	—	—	2592	Rawden, George	18 Aug.	—	—
2519	Kane, Arthur Bennett	12 Nov.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.	2593	Richardson, William	7 Nov.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.
2520	Kirkwood, John Thomas	14 Nov.	—	—	2594	Reed, Josiah	—	—	—
2521	La Touche, Wm. Degez	12 May	2 May	11 Apr.	2595	Rogerson, John George	15 Nov.	—	—
2522	La Touche, James L. D.	10 May	—	—	2596	Roche, George	19 Nov.	—	—
2523	Laurie, Alexander	24 May	—	—	2597	Roche, John	—	—	—
2524	Lee, William	1 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July	2598	Rosch, John	21 Nov.	—	—
2525	Lee, Edward	—	—	—	2599	Richardson, Patrick	23 Nov.	—	—
2526	Lodge, Joseph	2 Dec.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.	2600	Rosland, James	25 Nov.	—	—
2527	Laughon, Eufrosina	7 Nov.	—	—	2601	Rokinson, James Farrell	—	—	—
2528	Laphan, Henry	10 Nov.	—	—	2602	Rogson, Matthew Thomas	23 Nov.	—	—
2529	Laphan, Thomas	14 Nov.	—	—	2603	Rosney, Matthew	30 Nov.	—	—
2530	Leper, Alexander	17 Nov.	—	—	2604	Roske, Thomas	3 Dec.	—	—
2531	Lett, Stephen	21 Nov.	—	—	2605	Sears, John Pagot	1 Feb.	1 Feb.	11 Jan.
2532	Lagras, Charles John	22 Nov.	—	—	2606	Scudder, Stewart	3 Feb.	—	—
2533	Lindsay, Alexander	25 Nov.	—	—	2607	Shewin, William Henry	15 Feb.	—	—
2534	M'Kenny, Thomas	2 Feb.	1 Feb.	11 Jan.	2608	Smith, Samuel	—	—	—
2535	M'Her, Charles	15 Feb.	—	—	2609	Smith, William	26 Feb.	—	—
2536	Malley, Hannah	—	—	—	2610	Stoddert, Charles	—	—	—
2537	M'Kean, John	17 Feb.	—	—	2611	Storpe, Robert	—	—	—
2538	Martin, Richard C.	20 Feb.	—	—	2612	Straker, William	24 Feb.	—	—
2539	Martin, Samuel	5 May	9 May	11 Apr.	2613	Sweeney, James H.	4 May	2 May	11 Apr.
2540	M'Asley, James	4 May	—	—	2614	Stewart, Thomas	24 May	—	—
2541	M'Nara, George	9 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July	2615	Steady, Edwin	9 Aug.	—	—
2542	M'Nara, Daniel	11 Aug.	—	—	2616	Shaw, William	10 Aug.	—	—
2543	Moses, Thomas Robert	7 Nov.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.	2617	Stephens, John	11 Aug.	—	—
2544	Mason, William	—	—	—	2618	Stephens, Thomas	10 Nov.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.
2545	Madden, Andrew	6 Nov.	—	—	2619	Simpson, George B.	16 Nov.	—	—
2546	Martin, Francis	15 Nov.	—	—	2620	Scarlet, Frederick Augustus	14 Nov.	—	—
2547	M'Allister, Robert	—	—	—	2621	Schaefer, Clement Archer	—	—	—
2548	Mesher, John	16 Nov.	—	—	2622	Shropson, Richard C. S.	—	—	—
2549	Mesher, William	—	—	—	2623	Schroder, John, jun.	25 Nov.	—	—
2550	Moggs, William	19 Nov.	—	—	2624	Schroder, George	—	—	—
2551	Moggs, Thomas	19 Nov.	—	—	2625	Shen, Cornelia	10 Nov.	—	—
2552	Mosley, Henry	20 Nov.	—	—	2626	Shaw, George Augustus	—	—	—
2553	M'Donnell, Robert	—	—	—	2627	Southern, Thomas	—	—	—
2554	Muckle, William	25 Nov.	—	—	2628	Smith, Benjamin	—	—	—
2555	M'Kay, William	26 Nov.	—	—	2629	Smith, William	20 Nov.	—	—
2556	Murphy, John	28 Nov.	—	—	2630	Styleny, William	8 Dec.	—	—
2557	M'Donnell, Archibald	5 Dec.	—	—	2631	Taylor, John	1 Feb.	1 Feb.	11 Jan.
2558	Mears, Charles	13 Dec.	—	—	2632	Taylor, Robert	—	—	—
2559	Merrill, William	10 Feb.	1 Feb.	11 Jan.	2633	Talbot, Joseph	29 Feb.	—	—

No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Season.	Date of Notice of Registry.	No.	N A M E.	Date of Registry.	First Day of Registry Season.	Date of Notice of Registry.
	1850—continued.					1856—continued.			
2514	Turkington, John - - -	3 May	2 May	11 April	2668	Wahb, John - - -	3 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July
2545	Tilly, Thomas - - -	15 Aug.	1 Aug.	11 July	2669	Wahb, Holwell - - -	10 Aug.	—	—
2546	Thorne, Charles - - -	20 Aug.	—	—	2664	Wain, Thomas - - -	15 Aug.	—	—
2547	Tier, Ormsell - - -	21 Nov.	7 Nov.	17 Oct.	2665	Whitehead, W. O'Callaghan	15 Aug.	—	—
2548	Tuckington, William - -	22 Nov.	—	—	2666	Widley, Frederick William	7 Nov.	7 Nov.	11 Oct.
2549	Toole, Francis - - -	26 Nov.	—	—	2667	Widley, John - - -	—	—	—
2550	Turkington, Richardson, jun.	20 Nov.	—	—	2668	Wilson, Benjamin - - -	10 Nov.	—	—
2551	Thomas, Benjamin - - -	2 Dec.	—	—	2669	Wiser, James - - -	15 Nov.	—	—
2552	Willet, Henry - - -	3 Feb.	1 Feb.	11 Jan.	2670	Wissler, E. W. J. Thomas	16 Nov.	—	—
2553	Walsh, Henry Thomas - -	—	—	—	2671	Wissler, Trevor William	17 Nov.	—	—
2554	Woodhouse, the Rev. John -	—	—	—	2672	Wolton, George - - -	22 Nov.	—	—
2555	Winchert, James - - -	17 Feb.	—	—	2673	Wilson, Samuel - - -	—	—	—
2556	Wilson, Edward - - -	20 Feb.	—	—	2674	West, Mathew - - -	—	—	—
2557	Wilson, Richard - - -	1 Mar.	—	—	2675	Wibson, John - - -	30 Nov.	—	—
2558	Woodhouse, William - - -	2 May	2 May	11 April	2676	Winkler, John - - -	4 Dec.	—	—
2559	Williams, Leonard Douglas	—	—	—	2677	Williams, Adolphus Alex.	6 Dec.	—	—
2560	Whithead, Joseph - - -	4 May	—	—	2678	Wilson, William - - -	7 Dec.	—	—
2561	Widley, David - - -	3 May	—	—					

Archer & Long, Clerks of the Peace.

My Lord,

Dublin-castle, 13 April 1837.

REPRESENTING to the order of the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Fictitious Votes, Ireland, I am commanded by the Lord Lieutenant to transmit herewith a Return which has been just received from the clerks of the peace, of the number and names of freemen registered as voters in the City of Dublin, since the passing of the Reform Act for Ireland, &c.

Your Lordship will perceive, by the accompanying letter from the clerks of the peace, that the other Returns required from them are in progress, and will be furnished with the utmost possible despatch.

I have, &c.

Lord Granville Somerset, &c. &c. &c.

T. Drummond.

Sir,

Clerks of the Peace Office, 11 April 1837.

We herewith have the honour to transmit the Return in reference to the City of Dublin, required by order of the Select Committee of the House of Commons, dated the 14th February last,

And we beg leave to acquaint you, for the information of the Lord Lieutenant, that the several other Returns ordered to be made by the same Committee, although not so voluminous as the Return now transmitted, yet numerous references to official documents being indispensable, much time and attention are necessarily employed in the progress of their completion; his Excellency may, however, rest assured that we shall furnish these Returns with the utmost possible despatch.

We have, &c.

T. Drummond, Esq., &c.

Archer & Long.

Appendix (G.)

Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

Appendix (G.)

A RETURN of the several Houses in the Towns in *Ireland*, which Return MEMBERS to serve in PARLIAMENT; specifying the Streets in which each is situated, its Number, and the Name of the Occupant; together with the Annual Value of each, as estimated and returned by the Valutors appointed to make the Annual Apportionment of Rates and Taxes for Municipal Purposes, either under the Provisions of the Act 9 Geo. 4, c. 82, or of any Local or Private Acts passed for the Regulation of these Towns, or of the New Valuation Act, where it has come into operation.

A R M A G H.

HOUSES of the Yearly Value of £. 10 and upwards.

No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.
	Lower English-street:	£. s.		Lower English-st.—cont ^d .	£. s.
1	Francis M'Cormick	10 -	114	John Lyle	12 -
39	Hugh Lynch	10 -	121	Samuel Thompson	11 -
40	John Duff	10 10	128	John M'Elroy	10 -
41	Henry Mooney	10 -			
42	Patrick Cunningham	10 -		Upper English-street:	
63	Bernard Quin	10 -	1	William Caldwell	24 10
54	John Garland	10 -	2	Edward Parker	24 -
57	Edward Murphy	10 -	3	Peter M'Kee	20 -
58	Peter Kelly	10 -	4	James Donnelly	22 -
59	James M'Elroy	12 -	5	Sarah M'Glone	19 -
64	John Woods	10 -	6	Edward Hynes	30 -
65	James Donoghue	13 -	7	Patrick Downey	15 -
66	Owen Farley	10 -	8	Edward Corvin	18 -
68	James Dunne	12 -	9	Thomas Craig	45 -
70	Margaret Williamson	10 -	10	Arthur Branigan	19 -
71	Andrew Johnson	10 -	11	Bernard Hagan	19 -
73	John Allen	10 -	12	George Barues	24 -
74	Peter M'Gaughey	14 -	13	Miss Atkinson	30 -
75	Johnson Nelson	22 -	14	James F. Bell	50 -
77	John Williams	30 -	15	William Blacker	100 -
78	James Vogan	34 -	16	Mrs. Lyle	70 -
79	John Graham	16 -	17	John M'Kinstry	90 -
80	Patrick Corvin	15 -	18	R. J. Thouton	100 -
81	Michael M'Beide	19 -	19	Robert C. Hardy	70 -
82	Patrick Carberry	10 -	20	Leonard Dobbin, jun.	100 -
83	Patrick Devlin	19 -	21	John Stanley	130 -
	Patrick Stores	10 -	22	James Moore	40 -
84	James Dickson	19 -	23	Mrs. Dundass	25 -
85	Robert Caldwell	29 10	24	James Rickard	60 -
86	John Ernst	10 -	25	Hugh Frenan	55 -
87	Cathrine Donnelly	12 -	26	Dr. Vogan	60 -
89	James Feely	14 -	27	Matthew Bell	130 -
90	Patrick M'Kew	12 -	28	Messrs. Colville	63 -
92	James Bennett, jun.	40 -	29	Robert Cochrane	50 -
93	James Starr	18 -	30	James Smyth	50 -
94	Ditto	16 -	31	Robert M'Endow	65 -
95	William Walker	20 -	32	Samuel Gardner	50 -
96	Joshua Vogan & Co.	160 -	33	Ditto	75 -
97	Edward M'Donald	15 -	34	Mrs. Dundass	45 -
98	William Jones	10 -	35	Alexander Bright	20 -
99	Fleanor Steele	10 -	36	Greer & Mackay	70 -
100	William O'Neill	10 10	37	William Rogers	110 -
101	Robert Gurvey	10 -	38	John Adams	80 -
104	Patrick M'Manns	12 -	39	William Carroll	40 -
105	John Downey	10 -	40	Uster Bank	80 -
111	Francis Steaven	12 -	41	Vogan & Matthews	55 -

No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
	Upper English-st.—cont'd.	£. s.		Abbey-street—cont'd.	£. s.	
42	William M'Williams	60 -	14	John Davidson (vacant)	12 -	
43	George Barnes	25 -	15	Mr. Kitchener	50 -	
44	William Hanna	28 -	16	John Frazier	20 -	
45	John Sling	34 -	17	Rev. ——— M'Casland	26 -	
46	Dr. Sloane	24 -	18	General M'Donald	80 -	
47	James Allen	17 -	19	Most Rev. Dr. Cully	50 -	
48	William Dillon	42 -	20	James Kearney	55 -	
50	William Smyth	42 -	21	Thomas K. Evans	80 -	
51	Misses Nicholson	50 -	22	Rev. R. Allott	150 -	
52	John Dunkin	50 -	27	Beecham Hill	66 -	
53	John M'Waters	50 -	28	Jacob Barret	20 -	
54	Dr. Bryce	40 -	29	Miss Campbell	15 -	
55	John Shanne, jun.	50 -	31	William Chery	12 -	
56	Robert Anderson	25 -	32	James Baxter	10 -	
57	Miss Davis	16 -	33	Robert Baxter	14 -	
58	Thomas M'Caan	60 -	34	Margaret Robinson	24 -	
59	Robert Cochrane	80 -	35	Miss Cumming	30 -	
60	M'Instry & Dickson	19 -	36	William Blais	12 -	
61	Robert Fulton	59 -	37	Hugh Brean	14 -	
62	Osborne Kidd	120 -	45	J. Thompson	20 -	
63	Meredith Armstrong	30 -	50	Andrew Ewing	10 -	
64	Miss Boyd	30 -	51	John Ewing	10 -	
65	Miss Waugh	52 10	52	Richard Ewing	10 -	
66	Robert M'Instry	35 -	55	William Pulton	110 -	
67	Dr. Colvan	31 10				
68	N. W. Upton	40 -		Melbourne-terraces:		
69	John Fegan	100 -	1	Lee M'Kinstry	60 -	
70	John Sloane, sen.	30 -	2	Same	60 -	
71	Joshua F. Noble	23 -	3	Same	60 -	
72	John Calvert	25 -				
73	Robert Briers	14 -		College-street:		
75	Bernard O'Neill	12 -	1	John Ferns	10 -	
76	Charity Caldwell	21 -	2	James Rickard	16 -	
77	Robert Briers	20 -	3	William Henry	45 -	
79	Ezekiel Bruce	10 -	4	John Stanley, jun.	35 -	
			5	Hugh H. Baxter	48 -	
			6	Rev. Mr. Ivers	48 -	
8	Kelly's-court:		7	William Blair	48 -	
	Lecky Graham	10 -	8	Joseph Kidd	48 -	
			9	Jacob Barret	45 -	
1	Limally-lane:		10	— Benson	35 -	
	Edward Parkinson	10 -	11	Hugh M'Colla	55 -	
			12	James M'Conn	21 -	
	Lyle's-gateway:		13	Rev. Dr. Miller	60 -	
1	Representatives of A. Lyle	200 -	15	William W. Algeo	180 -	
			16	James Res	12 -	
	Russel-street:			John Stanley	35 -	
1	Samuel Gardner	35 -				
				Market-street:		
	Mill-street:		1	James Ogle	50 -	
1	John Deenan	10 -	2	William Christian	55 -	
4	Felix Hughes	19 -	3	George Armstrong	70 -	
13	Peter Quin	12 -	4	James Corrigan	40 -	
17	David Thom	10 -	5	George Corry	45 -	
			6	John Simpson	40 -	
	Dawson-street:		7	Vacant	30 -	
12	Robert Fulton	10 -	8	Henry Dickson	35 -	
16	James Nugent	10 -	9	Henry M'Keen	70 -	
23	Thomas Gilechrist	20 -	10	Henry Dickson	30 -	
24	Bernard Donnelly	10 -	11	John Greeves	70 -	
			12	Same	15 -	
	Abbey-street:		14	George Scott	80 -	
6	James Rickard	10 -	15	William Johnson	61 -	
8	Rev. P. S. Henry	40 -	16	John Kane	90 -	
9	John Davison	30 -	20	Francis Lennon	10 -	
10	Thomas M'Williams	25 -	21	John Corr	10 -	
11	Michael Coleill	18 -	22	Charles M'Masters	24 -	
12	Robert Scott	14 -	23	Alexander Gibson	15 -	
13	Miss Quigly	12 -	23			

(continued)

Appendix (G.)

Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.
	Market-street—cont ^d .	£. s.		Chapel-lane :	£. s.
24	James Lappin - - -	14 -	10	James Bennett - - -	30 -
25	James Acheson - - -	13 -	32	Widow Kelly - - -	10 -
29	Thomas Furnham - - -	18 -		Scotch-street :	
30	Daniel M'Allea - - -	20 -		Henton & Knox - - -	80 -
32	John Jackson - - -	30 -	1	Mary Carrigan - - -	35 -
33	Patrick Morris - - -	10 -	2	Rebecca Scott - - -	42 -
34	Miss O'Neill - - -	10 -	3	John Vallery - - -	45 -
37	William M'Caffry - - -	10 -	4	James Close - - -	60 -
39	(Vacant) Wm. Bond - - -	10 -	5	Messrs. M'Williams - - -	60 -
41	James Bennett - - -	60 -	7	Hans M'Cartin - - -	16 -
48	(Vacant) R. Henderson - - -	18 -	9	Mrs. M'Crum - - -	25 -
49	James Rowm - - -	11 -	10	John Kingston - - -	20 -
54	Owen Fenon - - -	14 -	11	James Richard - - -	10 -
55	John Long - - -	11 -	12	G. K. M'Shane - - -	22 -
56	Moses Eager - - -	14 -	13	James King - - -	36 -
57	Henry Smithe - - -	12 -	14	Thomas Grattan - - -	36 -
60	Thomas Moore - - -	19 -	15	John Gray - - -	42 -
61	Ezekiel Bruce - - -	19 -	16	Doctor Leslie - - -	45 -
62	Thomas M'Glelland - - -	30 -	17	William Campbell - - -	52 10
	Church-lane :		19	James Stanley - - -	70 -
1	James Sear - - -	18 -	20	John Henry - - -	32 -
6	Patrick M'Caffry - - -	15 -	21	Alexander Dickson - - -	31 10
13	Mrs. Noble - - -	15 -	22	John Besty - - -	60 -
17	John Jackson - - -	12 -	23	Robert Stevenson - - -	25 -
22	James Collin - - -	10 -	24	William Leamox - - -	18 -
23	Thomas Eager - - -	14 -	25	Arthur Hughes - - -	30 -
	Vicar's-hill :		26	Robert M'Cart - - -	13 10
1	Benjamin Cranmet - - -	12 -	27	Samuel White - - -	13 10
2	Mrs. Campbell - - -	14 -	28	William Gray - - -	19 -
3	John Lee - - -	14 -	29	John Cowan - - -	25 -
4	J. W. M. P. Edmonson - - -	14 -	30	George Broady - - -	40 -
5	George Scott - - -	10 -	31	Edward Lory - - -	21 -
6	John Garbett - - -	28 -	32	James Rickard - - -	20 -
7	David Hamilton - - -	30 -	33	John M'Parlan - - -	20 -
8	James Grooves - - -	20 -	34	Thomas Smyth - - -	60 -
9	MUSIC HALL - - -	20 -	35	William Nelson - - -	10 -
10	Mr. Forriell - - -	38 -	36	James Donnelly - - -	19 -
11	B. Reddall - - -	20 -	37	John Scammerville - - -	34 -
12	Same - - -	12 -	38	John Barnes - - -	70 -
	Castle-street :		39	Same - - -	30 -
3	George Gordon - - -	14 -	40	James M'Kenna - - -	19 -
5	Patrick M'Gark - - -	11 -	41	John Bell - - -	15 -
11	Peter Dehny - - -	12 -	42	George Passmore - - -	18 -
12	James M'Kenna - - -	10 -	43	John Kelly - - -	16 -
13	John Ross - - -	15 -	44	James Duffin - - -	10 -
21	Cathrine Cosgrave - - -	10 -	45	William M'Gloze - - -	11 -
22	Louvenne Lyud - - -	10 -	46	John Ashton - - -	30 -
25	Patrick Hughes - - -	20 -	47	Philip Keenan - - -	30 -
25	William Verdon - - -	26 -	48	John Craig - - -	30 -
29	Patrick Hogan - - -	18 -	49	Charles Kays - - -	30 -
30	Dennis Bannigan - - -	16 -	50	Robert Birch - - -	25 -
31	John Lappin - - -	16 -	51	Alexander Dickson - - -	18 -
32	Michael Herron - - -	12 -	52	James Graham - - -	34 -
33	John M'Anespy - - -	26 5	53	Mr. Mayne - - -	36 -
36	Same - - -	12 -	54	Leonard Dobbin, M.P. - - -	150 -
37	Sylvester Quin - - -	25 -	55	Thomas Dobbin - - -	70 -
38	Patrick Mullin - - -	12 -	56	William Barnes - - -	36 -
41	Patrick Hughes - - -	10 -	57	John Hollywood - - -	50 -
55	Bernard Keating - - -	10 -	58	David Griffin - - -	10 -
60	Molly Hillands - - -	10 -	59	Patrick Hughes - - -	10 -
61	Patrick M'Faddin - - -	15 -	60	Mrs. Christy - - -	25 -
66	Daniel M'Keown, sen. - - -	13 -	61	Mrs. Bright - - -	18 -
67	Daniel M'Keown, jun. - - -	10 -	62	Cathrine Anderson - - -	26 -
69	Bernad Kelly - - -	10 -	63	William Henry - - -	26 -
70	Bernad Kelly - - -	10 -	64	Charles Foster - - -	26 -
71	Bernad M'Culla - - -	10 -	65		
72	George Breunann - - -	14 10	66		
73			67		

No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
	Scotch-street—continued.	£. s.		Palace-row—continued.	£. s.	
67	William Adams - - -	12 -	7	James Birse - - -	20 -	
68	Same - - -	24 -	8	John Adams - - -	12 -	
69	John Redpath - - -	28 -	9	John Craig - - -	12 -	
70	Edward Gardner - - -	40 -	10	Charles Foster - - -	18 -	
71	George M'Cartney - - -	35 -		Little Barrack-street:		
72	Joseph Matthews - - -	80 -		Samuel Wright - - -	20 -	
73	Miss M'Alcay - - -	21 -	4	Arthur M'Ganly - - -	10 -	
74	Mrs. Campbell - - -	50 -	17			
75	Mortough Corrigan - - -	45 -		Barrack-hill:		
76	Samuel Craig - - -	52 10	1	Thomas M'Dowel - - -	15 -	
77	Robert Heron - - -	15 -	2	William Sergeant - - -	18 -	
78	Robert Burdison - - -	35 -	3	Francis Clegg - - -	12 -	
79	George Cochran (bank) - - -	70 -	4	William Hughes - - -	10 10	
	Burlinson's-entry:		5	William Corvan - - -	10 10	
9	William Boyd - - -	10 -	6	William Parker - - -	10 -	
	M'Crone's-lane:		7	Hans Gordon - - -	10 -	
11	James Burns - - -	15 -	8	James Maxwell - - -	10 -	
12	S. and E. Gardner - - -	30 -	9	John M'Laughlin - - -	10 -	
	Barrack-street:		10	William Fedy - - -	10 10	
1	Arthur M'Ganly - - -	10 -	11	Samuel Gilliland - - -	10 10	
2	William Love - - -	22 -	12	William Ralp - - -	10 -	
3	Mrs. Johnson - - -	22 -	13	Charles Rocks - - -	10 -	
4	Thomas Nugent - - -	20 -	14	Eneas Quin - - -	10 -	
5	Francis Coor - - -	17 -	15	John Benson - - -	12 -	
6	John W. Eves - - -	17 -	16	Patrick Murphy - - -	15 -	
7	Mr. Roberts - - -	17 -	17	George Irwin - - -	10 -	
8	Patrick Fanning - - -	17 -	18	William Cochran - - -	10 -	
9	H. Tronson - - -	17 -	19	John Kitson - - -	14 -	
10	— Glancy - - -	17 -	20	Thomas M'Cann - - -	10 -	
11	Thomas M'Alcay - - -	18 -	21	George Ewing - - -	10 -	
12	Andrew Jeffers - - -	10 -	22	Donald White - - -	18 -	
13	William Hamilton - - -	16 -	23	Thomas Gibson - - -	15 -	
14	Thomas Ross - - -	10 -	24	Lieut. Crawford - - -	21 -	
15	John Muriugh - - -	10 -	25	Samuel Kitson - - -	14 -	
16	Mrs. M'Williams - - -	18 -	26	Elizabeth O'Hare - - -	10 -	
17	William Watson - - -	10 -	27	William Parker - - -	12 -	
18	John Denon - - -	12 -	28	Samuel Kitson - - -	10 -	
19	Samuel Kearney - - -	13 -	29	Barrack Well-lane:		
20	William Colvan - - -	10 10	30	Patrick Feare - - -	14 -	
21	William Simpson - - -	10 10		Charlemont-place:		
22	Elizabeth Stockdale - - -	10 10	1	Doctor Kidd - - -	105 -	
23	Serjeant Crozier - - -	12 -	2	Miss Honey - - -	105 -	
24	Charles Maddon - - -	12 -	3	Colonel Bainbridge - - -	105 -	
25	Stanley Smith - - -	12 -	4	Colonel Napier - - -	110 -	
26	John Durie - - -	11 -	5	John Barnes - - -	120 -	
27	William Smith - - -	11 -		Beresford-row:		
28	Hugh Quin - - -	12 -	1	Arthur J. Kelly - - -	120 -	
29	Hugh M'Master - - -	50 -	2	Michael Magee - - -	75 -	
30	James Corvan - - -	19 -	3	David Beatty - - -	40 -	
31	James Moore - - -	18 -	4	John M'Kinstry - - -	80 -	
32	John Dodds - - -	15 -	5	Mrs. Colthurst - - -	65 -	
33	John Taylor - - -	18 10	6	Mr. Winder - - -	65 -	
34	Edward Courtney - - -	10 -	7	Robert Baxter - - -	55 -	
35	Mr. Kingsmill - - -	18 10	8	Same - - -	65 -	
36	Mrs. Fivay - - -	18 10	9	Doctor Cumming - - -	70 -	
37	Mrs. Gray - - -	13 -	10	Beecham Hill - - -	70 -	
38	Mr. Andrews - - -	13 -		Rokeby-green:		
39	Patrick Fanning - - -	18 -	1	Ordnance, Bond of	52 10	
40	James Roberts - - -	10 -	2	Major Shaw - - -	52 10	
41	John Farr - - -	10 -	3	Sinclair Carroll - - -	52 10	
42	Henry Hamill - - -	10 -	4	Same - - -	52 10	
43	John Farr, jun. - - -	10 -	5	Same - - -	60 -	
44	James Wier - - -	10 -	6	David Scarslet - - -	80 -	
45	James Cumming - - -	65 -	7	Miss Matthews - - -	13 10	
	Palace-row:		8	James Stunly - - -	10 -	
5	William Murray - - -	10 10	9	William Barnes - - -	25 -	
6	James Birnie - - -	20 -	10	George Barnes - - -	35 -	
			11	Archibald M'Connell - - -	15 -	
			12			
			13			
			14			
			15			
			16			
			17			
			18			
			19			
			20			
			21			
			22			
			23			
			24			
			25			
			26			
			27			
			28			
			29			
			30			
			31			
			32			
			33			
			34			
			35			
			36			
			37			
			38			
			39			
			40			
			41			
			42			
			43			
			44			
			45			

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.
	Dobbin-street :	£. s.		Thomas-street—contd.	£. s.
1	Philip Keenan - - -	110 -	25	Andrew Boyd & Co. - - -	40 -
2	Alexander Graham - - -	13 -	26	Thomas M'Whorter - - -	28 -
3	Charles M'Donald - - -	13 -	27	John Carvill - - -	70 -
4	William Shropshire - - -	14 -	28		
5	William Millar - - -	14 -	29	Frances Barr - - -	18 -
6	Mr. Parker - - -	14 -	30	Robert Cole - - -	17 -
7	Mr. Kerr - - -	14 -	31	Andrew O. Agar - - -	19 -
8	William Mulholland - - -	14 -	32	John Anderson - - -	18 -
9	Mrs. Wynne - - -	13 -	33	Samuel Scott - - -	10 -
10	Miss Carpenter - - -	18 -	34	Samuel Magowan - - -	18 -
11	Miss Palmer - - -	20 -	35	Arthur Conry - - -	16 -
12	Mrs. Bolton - - -	26 -	36	Samuel M'Carlin - - -	19 -
13	James Rickard - - -	15 -	37	Arthur Donnelly - - -	19 -
14	William Flack - - -	23 -	38	Thomas Kearns - - -	32 -
15	William Gardner - - -	50 -	39	William M'Laughlin - - -	13 -
16	Police Barrack - - -	91 -	40	Thomas Dowd - - -	10 -
17	John Greer - - -	21 -	41	John M'Geough - - -	12 -
18	— M'Callagh - - -	18 -	42	Bernard Rafferty - - -	13 -
19	Benjamin Brown - - -	18 -	43	James Savage - - -	16 -
20	Patrick M'Court - - -	21 -	44	Edward Kelly - - -	19 -
21	Greer & Boyd - - -	21 -	—	Same - - -	10 -
22	Robert M'Hride - - -	14 -	46	Thomas Simpson - - -	10 -
23	Patrick Gribbin - - -	24 -	47	Thomas Orr - - -	18 -
24	Miss Jones - - -	16 -	48	James Cumming - - -	22 -
25	Mrs. Moore - - -	15 -	49	John Mulligan - - -	13 -
26	Mrs. Foster - - -	15 -	50	David Dodds - - -	14 -
27	Thomas Ross - - -	12 -	51	Patrick Rogers - - -	11 -
28	J. F. Andrews - - -	13 -	52	Charles Morton - - -	12 10
29	John Bannigan - - -	22 -	53	Henry L. Prentice - - -	16 -
30	John Corrigan - - -	35 -	54	Thomas Murray - - -	16 -
	Yam-sheds, Dobbin-st. :		55	Charles Hillock - - -	30 -
10	Towaley & Gillespy - - -	12 -	56	James Grescen - - -	15 -
23	Robert Hodge - - -	15 -	57	Thomas Henderson - - -	13 -
23	L. Dobbin, m.r. - - -	10 -	58	Patrick Loughnan - - -	15 -
	Lisen Hall-street :		59	William M'Callagh - - -	15 -
18	Robert M'Ardle - - -	10 10	60	John Sling - - -	10 -
17	John Stevens - - -	12 -	61	John Castmill - - -	10 -
21	John Kerr - - -	14 -	62	William Boyd, jun. - - -	39 -
22	John Allen - - -	12 -	63	John Cullen - - -	25 -
23	Sergeant Matchet - - -	26 -	64	William Boyd, sen. - - -	38 -
25	James Collins - - -	10 -	65	Charles Connoily - - -	21 -
	Abbey-lane :			Ogle-street :	
1	Patrick Graham - - -	10 -	1	William Eno - - -	19 -
10	Sarah Taggart - - -	10 -	2	Miss Jones - - -	20 -
23	Thomas Wilton - - -	13 -	3	Margaret Reilly - - -	20 -
30	Terence Conlon - - -	10 -	4	John Richardson - - -	20 -
	Thomas-street :		7	Hugh M'Kenna - - -	10 -
3	William Motson - - -	14 -	8	Hugh Donnelly - - -	10 -
4	James Bradley - - -	24 10	9	Bernard M'Crory - - -	10 -
5	Robert Barnes - - -	15 -	10	John Carty - - -	10 -
6	M. A. Davis - - -	12 -	11	Nicholas M'Connell - - -	11 -
7	Matthew Milting - - -	18 -	12	James Barrill - - -	11 -
8	John Wilson - - -	27 -	13	Cornelius O'Callaghan - - -	11 -
9	Laurance Sherry - - -	18 -	14	John M'Gurk - - -	10 -
10	Sidney Eager - - -	12 -	15	George Barnes - - -	48 -
11	George Penton - - -	32 -	16	Walsh Linton, sen. - - -	16 -
12	John Douglass - - -	12 -	17	Walsh Linton, jun. - - -	16 -
13	William Gray - - -	17 -	18	Hans Gordon - - -	10 -
14	Robert Gray - - -	19 -	19	— Smith - - -	16 -
15	Mrs. Haddock - - -	35 -	20	Thomas Kearns - - -	12 -
16	Hugh Pegan - - -	18 10	21	Owen Loughnan - - -	10 -
17	Thomas Appleby - - -	10 -	22	Thomas Kearns - - -	40 -
18	Mrs. Christian - - -	20 -	23	Francis M'Kee - - -	24 -
19	Mrs. M'Guin - - -	20 -	24	Mrs. Dunleavy - - -	13 -
20	John Dickson - - -	13 -	25	Mrs. M'Laughlin - - -	10 -
21	James Malton - - -	13 -	26	Mary Trennor - - -	15 -
22	Henry Sling - - -	10 -	27	Patrick Donnelly - - -	10 -
23	James Bryars - - -	20 -	28	John Cassidy - - -	10 -
24	John Ashe - - -	18 -	29	Patrick Hamill - - -	10 -
			30	Francis Hoy - - -	10 -

No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
	Ogle-street—cont'd.	£. s.		Irish-street—cont'd.	£. s.	
43	John Gavin - - -	10 -	113	Moses Baxter - - -	10 -	
44	Luke Collins - - -	10 -	115	Edward Neala - - -	12 -	
45	Henry Savage - - -	28 -	116	James English - - -	10 10	
46	Same - - - - -	16 -	117	John Weulle - - -	10 -	
46	Patrick Lennon - - -	19 -	118	Mrs. Healy - - - -	12 -	
49	Patrick Quin - - -	10 -		Gallows-hill:		
50	Timothy O'Sullivan - - -	10 -		John Gibbin - - -	10 -	
51	Bernard Keating - - -	10 10	1	Charles Quin - - -	10 -	
52	Hugh Hailey - - -	10 -	2	Primrose-street:		
53	Philip Rice - - - -	10 -		John M'Caraher - - -	20 -	
55	Bernard Short - - -	10 -	1	Salthax-court:		
60	William Fegan - - -	12 -		Michael Rice - - -	10 -	
61	Eliza Galter - - -	12 10	1	Charter School-lane:		
	Irish-street:			Thomas Harvey - - -	10 -	
1	James Monaghan - - -	16 -	7	Henry Gubbins - - -	10 -	
2	John Mullin - - - -	15 -	9	Joseph Boyd - - -	12 -	
3	George Hughes - - -	10 -	30	David Moore - - -	16 -	
4	John Hart - - - -	12 -	42	John Lee - - - -	25 -	
6	John Molloy - - - -	10 -	69	Thomas Burrell - - -	10 -	
7	John Gibbin - - - -	10 -	78	Joseph M'Choud - - -	10 -	
8	John M'Geary - - -	10 -	88	Patrick Rice - - -	10 -	
11	John Gibbin - - - -	10 -	95	James Duggan - - -	15 -	
24	George M'Case - - -	18 -	109	James Webster - - -	10 -	
25	Anthony M'Case - - -	10 -	130	Callan-street:		
27	John O'Neill - - - -	10 -		Robert Miller - - -	12 -	
31	Robert M'Case - - -	34 -	1	Stewart Rocks - - -	10 -	
32	Hugh O'Hare - - - -	10 -	27	James Glas - - - -	10 -	
40	James Rogers - - -	10 -	46	John Kerr - - - -	10 -	
43	Edward Connolly - - -	10 -	49	Thomas Warren - - -	12 -	
43	Richard Lewis - - -	10 -	62	James M'Gurgan - - -	10 -	
78	John Ryan - - - -	10 -	84	Thomas Healy - - -	10 -	
82	John Corr - - - -	10 -	86	Callan-row:		
84	John Jones - - - -	30 -		William Graham - - -	10 10	
85	Captain Wade - - -	24 -	11	Callan-street-lane:		
86	Edward Woods - - -	15 -		Mr. Loddell - - - -	75 -	
87	John Toner - - - -	21 -	26	Demense:		
88	Thomas Pillow - - -	10 -		His Grace the most Rev. the Archbishop of Ar- magh and Primate of Ireland.	600 -	
89	Mrs. Carnaugh - - -	26 -				
92	Peter M'Donnell - - -	10 -	1			
98	Thomas Callaghan - - -	10 -				
101	John Cochrane - - -	10 -				
107	George Wilton - - -	12 -				

RECAPITULATION of the Streets and Number of Houses from £. 10 upwards.

Streets.	Number of Houses.	Streets.	Number of Houses.
Lower English-street - - -	48	Barrack-hill - - - -	28
Upper English-street - - -	76	Barrack Well-lane - - -	1
Killy's-court - - - -	1	Charlemont-place - - -	5
Lisally-lane - - - -	1	Berresford-row - - - -	10
Lyle's-gateway - - - -	1	Rokeby-green - - - -	10
Rassel-street - - - -	1	Dobbin-street - - - -	33
Mill-street - - - -	4	Linen Hall-street - - -	6
Dawson-street - - - -	4	Abbey-lane - - - -	4
Abbey-street - - - -	31	Thomas-street - - - -	61
Melbourne-terrace - - -	3	Ogle-street - - - -	39
College-street - - - -	15	Irish-street - - - -	33
Market-street - - - -	38	Gallows-hill - - - -	2
Church-lane - - - -	6	Primrose-street - - -	1
Vicar's-hill - - - -	12	Salthax-court - - - -	1
Castle-street - - - -	96	Charter School-lane - - -	10
Chapel-lane - - - -	2	Callan-street - - - -	7
Scotch-street - - - -	74	Callan-row - - - -	1
Burlinson's-entry - - -	1	Callan-street-lane - - -	1
M'Crum's-lane - - - -	2	Demense - - - -	1
Barrack-street - - - -	45		
Palace-row - - - -	6		
Little Barrack-street - - -	2		
		TOTAL - - - -	653

William M'Williams, Chairman.
Patrick Gibbin, Clerk.

Armagh, 31 March 1837.

HOUSES under the Value of £. 10 per Annum.

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Town
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.
	Lower English-street :	£. s.		Lower English-st.—cont ^d .	£. s.
2	Francis M'Connick	4 -	112	Mark Cosgrove	9 -
3	Owen M'Conn	5 -	113	James Cosgrove	6 -
4	Nicholas Sbesky	5 -	115	Thomas Treanor	6 -
5	George Evans	4 -	116	James Elliott	6 -
6	Hugh M'Parland	4 -	117	Thomas Platt	6 -
7	Peter M'Callion	2 -	118	John Robb	6 -
8	Hugh Sleavin	2 -	119	George Evans	6 -
9	Peter M'Connell	3 10	120	John Williamson	6 -
10	Michael Mullin	3 10	122	Charles Brown	6 -
11	George Mullin	4 -	123	William Greer	6 -
12	Arthur Quin	4 -	124	— Twyford	5 -
13	James Goodfellow	5 -	—	George Robinson	6 -
14	James M'Case	5 -	125	Robert Morrow	5 -
15	John Rafferty	6 -	126	John Taggart	6 -
16	— Brown	6 -	127	Peter Molloy	6 -
17	James Magee	6 10	—	John M'Elroy	5 -
18	John Mitchell	6 10	129	James M'Geough	3 -
19	Robert Johnson	6 10	130	John Jamison	4 -
20	Patrick Murphy	6 10	131	William M'Donald	3 -
21	Robert Conway	6 10			
22	Patrick Carberry	3 -		Upper English-street :	
23	Thomas Mullin	3 -	49	Thomas Moore	8 -
24	Edward Connolly	3 -	74	Henry Hughes	4 -
25	Patrick Graham	3 -			
26	Owen Rafferty	3 -		Bondbrook :	
27	Edward Townsend	4 10	1	Rose M'Geary	3 -
28	Charles Baker	4 10	2	Doris Williams	3 -
29	Allen M'Kerry	4 10	3	John Cappa	3 -
30	John Donahison	3 10	4	Thomas M'Glone	4 -
31	Arthur Davlin	9 -	5	Mary Downey	4 -
32	Patrick Hooy	4 -	6	John Murray	3 -
33	James Deadwell	3 -	7&8	George Sherry	7 -
34	Samuel Mills	3 -	—	M'Connick & Co.	1 10
35	Peter M'Kee	3 -	9	William Treanor	1 -
36	George Moore	6 -	10	Same	9 -
37	Terence Doherty	6 -	11	Patrick M'Abbe	3 -
38	Samuel Armaour	6 -	12	James Kearney	8 -
43	John M'Kerry	4 -	13	John Williamson	3 -
44	Cathrine Nugent	4 -	14	Michael Mullin	3 10
45	James Lillburne	4 -	15	Sarah Crawford	2 -
46	Robert Garvey	3 -			
47	Francis M'Glone	5 -		Wood's-entry :	
48	Joseph M'Kinley	5 -	1	Eleanor M'Iver	1 -
49	John Kearney	3 -	2	John Hagan	1 10
50	William Orr	6 -			
51	William Dunne	6 -		Kelly's-gateway :	
52	Philip Cosgrove	4 -	1	Edward Kelly	8 -
—	Edward Murphy	3 10			
55	Patrick Jordan	6 -		Magee's-entry :	
56	John White	8 -	1	Alexander M'Lane	2 -
60	Francis M'Parlan	5 -	2	Jane Ashe	9 -
61	Francis Agnew	5 -			
62	Andrew Barnes	9 -		Kelly's-court :	
63	Anne Hamilton	2 10	1	Daniel M'Donald	2 10
67	Thomas Walker	8 -	2	Edward Kelly	2 10
69	Peter M'Kenna	9 -	3	William Wilson	2 10
72	Philip Corran	4 -	4	Peter M'Key	2 10
75	Felix Blunray	3 -	5	William Moore	2 10
88	Richard Morny	7 -	6	William Latimer	2 10
91	Patrick M'Kew	8 -	7	John O'Neill	2 10
102	Sarah Patterson	8 -	9	Edward Kelly	1 -
103	Thomas Asplant	6 10	10	Francis M'Cauley	2 10
105	Thomas M'Can	7 10	11	James Forsythe	2 10
107	James Dooley	6 -	12	William Bendley	2 10
108	Patrick M'Curkey	6 -	13	David M'Kay	2 10
109	Andrew Mallon	8 -	14	Robert Loughran	2 10
110	Patrick Grew	9 -	15	Peter Daly	2 10

No.	Inhabitant's Names.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitant's Names.	Yearly Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
M'Elroy's-entry :						
1	James M'Gwire - -	£. s.	19	Mill-street—continued.	£. s.	
2	Andrew Madden - -	4 -	16	Joshua T. Noble - -	3 -	
3	Miss Waugh - - -	1 10		Bernard Fox - - -	8 -	
		6 -		Lord Cremone - - -	1 -	
Devlin's-row :						
1	Patrick Boyle - - -	2 10	3	Dawson-street :		
2	Samuel Walker - - -	2 10	4	William Twyford - -	6 10	
3	George Steele - - -	2 10	5	Constantine O'Neill -	5 -	
4	Bernard Corr - - -	2 10	6	Mary Doan - - -	3 -	
5	Robert Smyth - - -	2 10	7	Peter M'Cormick - -	9 -	
6	James Raw - - - -	2 10	8	John Carberry - - -	8 -	
			9	Mrs. Scott - - - -	1 10	
			10	Alice Hughes - - -	6 -	
			11	Thomas Daffy - - -	6 -	
			12	Cornelius Hackett - -	8 -	
			13	James George - - -	5 -	
			14	Michael M'Parlan - -	5 -	
			15	John Murphy - - -	5 -	
			16	Henry Lamb - - -	8 -	
			17	Samuel Ewing - - -	2 -	
			18	Mary Ann Bolfour - -	3 10	
			19	Bridget Casey - - -	2 -	
			20	Richard Jackson - -	3 10	
			21	Mary Magill - - -	2 10	
			22	(Vacant) — Elliott - -	8 -	
			23	Henry M'Keown - - -	7 10	
			24	Bernard Hughes - - -	7 10	
			25	William Elliot - - -	7 10	
			26			
			27			
			28			
			29			
			30			
			31			
			32			
			33			
			34			
			35			
			36			
			37			
			38			
			39			
			40			
			41			
			42			
			43			
			44			
			45			
			46			
			47			
			48			
			49			
			50			
			51			
			52			
			53			
			54			
			55			
			56			
			57			
			58			
			59			
			60			
			61			
			62			
			63			
			64			
			65			
			66			
			67			
			68			
			69			
			70			
			71			
			72			
			73			
			74			
			75			
			76			
			77			
			78			
			79			
			80			
			81			
			82			
			83			
			84			
			85			
			86			
			87			
			88			
			89			
			90			
			91			
			92			
			93			
			94			
			95			
			96			
			97			
			98			
			99			
			100			
			101			
			102			
			103			
			104			
			105			
			106			
			107			
			108			
			109			
			110			
			111			
			112			
			113			
			114			
			115			
			116			
			117			
			118			
			119			
			120			
			121			
			122			
			123			
			124			
			125			
			126			
			127			
			128			
			129			
			130			
			131			
			132			
			133			
			134			
			135			
			136			
			137			
			138			
			139			
			140			
			141			
			142			
			143			
			144			
			145			
			146			
			147			
			148			
			149			
			150			
			151			
			152			
			153			
			154			
			155			
			156			
			157			
			158			
			159			
			160			
			161			
			162			
			163			
			164			
			165			
			166			
			167			
			168			
			169			
			170			
			171			
			172			
			173			
			174			
			175			
			176			
			177			
			178			
			179			
			180			
			181			
			182			
			183			
			184			
			185			
			186			
			187			
			188			
			189			
			190			
			191			
			192			
			193			
			194			
			195			
			196			
			197			
			198			
			199			
			200			
			201			
			202			
			203			
			204			
			205			
			206			
			207			
			208			
			209			
			210			
			211			
			212			
			213			
			214			
			215			
			216			
			217			
			218			
			219			
			220			
			221			
			222			
			223			
			224			
			225			
			226			
			227			
			228			
			229			
			230			
			231			
			232			
			233			
			234			
			235			
			236			
			237			
			238			
			239			
			240			
			241			
			242			
			243			
			244			
			245			
			246			
			247			
			248			
			249			
			250			
			251			
			252			
			253			
			254			
			255			
			256			

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.
	Market-street :	£. s.		Castle-street—contd.	£. s.
17	James Baxter - - -	6 10	23	James Crilly - - -	9 -
18	Patrick M'Veer - - -	6 10	26	Mary Smith - - -	5 -
19	Murtagh Cosigan - - -	6 -	27	Richard Kearay - - -	5 -
27	Hugh Treanor - - -	9 -	28	James Cassidy - - -	7 -
28	John Corran - - -	6 -	34	Patrick Trewland - - -	5 -
31	William Cassidy - - -	6 -	35	Daniel M'Kernan - - -	8 -
35	Hugh Miller - - -	9 -	39	Patrick Finnigan - - -	5 -
36	Edward Clancy - - -	9 -	40	Francis M'Kee - - -	6 -
38	(Vacant) William Bond - - -	5 -	43	Matthew Molloy - - -	4 -
49	James Hilcock - - -	6 -	44	Bernard Fohan - - -	6 10
43	Charles Baker - - -	6 -	45	(Vacant) Syl Quin - - -	5 -
44	William Kerr - - -	6 -	45	Daniel Hagan - - -	5 -
45	Richard Jayce - - -	6 -	47	Edward M'Alcer - - -	6 10
50	Hugh Treanor - - -	7 -	48	Michael Short - - -	5 -
51	Robert Ankrstell - - -	8 -	49	Bernard Cluton - - -	6 -
52	William Hunter - - -	7 -	50	James Flanigan - - -	6 -
53	Philip M'Ganity - - -	9 -	51	John Fitzpatrick - - -	5 -
58	(Vacant) James Carson - - -	4 -	52	Owen Hagan - - -	6 -
59	James Davison - - -	3 -	52	(Vacant) Syl Quin - - -	6 -
			54	Edward Cromie - - -	8 -
	Church-lane :		55	Thomas Mullin - - -	6 -
2	Elizabeth Young - - -	8 10	57	Gilbert Henderson - - -	8 -
3	Samuel M'Arthur - - -	7 -	58	Hugh Woods - - -	6 10
4	Henry Campbell - - -	5 -	59	Jane M'Carshar - - -	8 -
5	John Purvis - - -	7 -	62	Elizabeth Slevin - - -	3 10
7	Thomas M'Dowell - - -	2 10	63	William Geough - - -	6 10
8	George Wilton - - -	3 -	64	William Conlon - - -	8 -
9	William M'Keowna - - -	3 -	65	John Dunleavy - - -	8 -
10	Thomas Lacy - - -	4 -	68	John Fenix - - -	6 -
11	Elizabeth M'Callagh - - -	8 -	74	James King - - -	6 -
12	Henry Wilcocks - - -	5 -	75	James Kenney - - -	8 -
14	Henry Reynolds - - -	6 -	76	(Vacant) William Bond - - -	8 -
15	John Vaughan - - -	6 -			
16	John Jackson - - -	8 -		Ross-lane :	
18	Thomas Herold - - -	4 -	1	Patrick Hand - - -	2 -
19	John Morris - - -	4 -	2	Thomas Watson - - -	2 10
20	Patrick Cosgrove - - -	5 -	3	Daniel M'Carim - - -	2 10
21	Patrick M'Glade - - -	3 -	4	William Foy - - -	2 10
-	John Jackson - - -	8 -	5	John Ross - - -	2 10
			6	James Closs - - -	8 -
	Vicar's-hill :		6	Owen Hughes - - -	3 10
13	Mary Hughes - - -	3 -	7	James Duffy - - -	3 10
14	Thomas M'Call - - -	3 -	8	Edward M'Clusky - - -	3 -
15	Bridget Mooney - - -	4 -			
16	Michael Rice - - -	5 -		Chapel-lane :	
17	David Scalett - - -	8 -	1	Ann M'Avoy - - -	6 10
			2	John M'Coy - - -	5 -
	Quin's-row :		3	Bernard Rogers - - -	3 10
4	Margaret M'Clatchy - - -	2 -	4	Thomas Smyth - - -	3 10
6	John M'Luce - - -	1 10	5	John Lennox - - -	3 10
7	Thomas Meighan - - -	3 -	6	Patrick Diffin - - -	3 10
			7	James Fosse - - -	3 10
	Castle-street :		8	James Donnelly - - -	5 10
1	James Kase - - -	6 -	9	Edward Nugent - - -	6 10
2	Daniel Gibbin - - -	5 -	11	Patrick Woods - - -	8 10
6	Mary Hillan - - -	9 -	12	Charles Deighan - - -	6 10
7	Michael Croft - - -	3 10	13	Bernard Hughes - - -	6 10
8	Daniel Beavley - - -	6 -	14	Ann Clarke - - -	3 10
9	Hugh Mallin - - -	5 -	15	James Donoghay - - -	6 10
10	Thomas Diffin - - -	5 -	17	Thomas Johnson - - -	2 10
14	Mary Menough - - -	8 -	18	John M'Kenna - - -	2 10
15	James Kerr - - -	8 -	19	Alice M'Kee - - -	2 10
16	Hugh Cullin - - -	5 -	20	Robert M'Master - - -	5 -
17	John M'Callagh - - -	6 10	21	Thomas Valleby - - -	6 -
18	Mary M'Gowan - - -	8 -	22	Jane Ward - - -	3 10
19	Samuel M'Dowell - - -	8 -	23	— M'Grath - - -	4 -
20	William M'Cart - - -	8 -	24	Francis M'Covey - - -	4 -
			25	James Rice - - -	4 -

No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
	Chapel-lane—cont ^d .	£. s.		Little Barrack-st.—cont ^d .	£. s.	
25	Patrick Rocks - - -	4 -	11	Arthur Sherry - - -	5 -	
27	Mary Rogers - - -	4 -	12	John Willis - - -	5 -	
28	Mary Kearney - - -	4 -	13	Francis M'Connell - - -	4 -	
29	— M'Archie - - -	4 -	14	(Vacant) J. Summerville - - -	3 -	
30	Edward Kelly - - -	6 10	15	Francis Tighe - - -	5 -	
31	Same - - -	5 -	16	Peter Maguire - - -	5 -	
33	Adam Doyle - - -	6 10				
34	John Heyland - - -	6 10		Barrack-hill:		
35	Ann Martin - - -	6 10		Mr. Glenn - - -	5 -	
36	Mrs. Cooney - - -	6 10	19	John Kitson - - -	2 10	
37	Owen Keating - - -	5 10	20	Same - - -	3 -	
38	Francis Murphy - - -	5 10	21	Same - - -	2 10	
39	Mary Loft - - -	6 -	22	(Vacant) John Kitson - - -	3 -	
40	James Loughhead - - -	2 -	23	(Ditto) - ditto - - -	3 -	
41	Andrew Rowan - - -	6 -	24	William Blain - - -	3 10	
42	Edward Burns - - -	2 -	25	Mary Rocks - - -	1 10	
	Slings'-entry:		26	Francis Donnelly - - -	1 10	
1	John M'Nally - - -	3 10	33	Eliu Henderson - - -	0 -	
2	Patrick Murray - - -	3 10	34	Richard Abbot - - -	0 -	
	Scotch-street:		37	George Wilkin - - -	5 -	
5	Samuel Craig - - -	3 -	38	(Vacant) William Long - - -	5 -	
	Burlinson's-entry:		39	(Ditto) - ditto - - -	5 -	
1	Samuel Craig - - -	4 -		Robert Anderson - - -	4 -	
3	Loughran & Campbell - - -	6 -	40	Robert Coonan - - -	6 -	
4	James Close - - -	3 -	41	Samuel Gilliland - - -	7 10	
	M'Crum's-lane:		43	William Parker - - -	6 -	
1	Patrick Shields - - -	4 -	44	Robert Farrell - - -	5 -	
2	Joseph Loughran - - -	4 -	45	Hansy Allen - - -	3 -	
3	Mary Ann Ashe - - -	4 -				
4	(Vacant) Mrs. Greeves - - -	5 -		Barrack Well-lane:		
5	Same - - -	5 -	1	James Fagan - - -	5 -	
	Henry M'Kean - - -	5 -	2	Richard Kane - - -	5 -	
6	Charles Brown - - -	2 10	3	James Murphy - - -	5 -	
7	William Barnes - - -	1 10		George Broady - - -	1 -	
8	George Brown - - -	1 10	4	Bernard Cullen - - -	2 10	
9	Randall Donnelly - - -	2 10	5	Edward Kenras - - -	2 10	
10	William M'Crum - - -	7 -	6	Peter Cullen - - -	2 -	
	Palace-row:		7	Thomas Kennedy - - -	2 -	
1	Rebecca Simpson - - -	5 10	8	Same - - -	8 -	
2	(Vacant) James Cumag - - -	6 10	9	Thomas Kane - - -	7 -	
3	Mr. Coming - - -	7 -	10	Sarah M'Kinstry - - -	2 10	
4	Mrs. Scott - - -	6 10	11	Same - - -	2 10	
	James Birnie - - -	4 10	12	John Mallon - - -	9 -	
11	Samuel M'Clelland - - -	8 -	13	Same - - -	9 10	
12	George Burns - - -	5 -	14	John Cullen - - -	2 10	
13	Mary Smith - - -	5 -	15	(Vacant) J. Mallon - - -	2 -	
14	Hugh Walker - - -	6 -	16	John M'Gahan - - -	3 -	
15	Hugh Taylor - - -	7 -	17	Patrick M'Gahan - - -	3 -	
	Little Barrack-street:		18	Michael M'Kenna - - -	3 -	
1	Felix Donoughue - - -	5 -	19	John Kitson - - -	3 -	
2	Robert Nelson - - -	5 -	20	James Gildersnes - - -	3 -	
3	William Henry - - -	6 -	21	Peter Dragan - - -	3 -	
4	William M'Williams - - -	2 -	22	Alexander Gray - - -	5 -	
5	James Ferris - - -	6 -	23	John Kitson - - -	3 -	
6	Andrew Stevenson - - -	6 -	24	Samuel Nelson - - -	6 10	
7	(Vacant) Mrs. Connor - - -	5 -	25	William M'Elvany - - -	9 10	
8	Thomas Leithen - - -	5 -	26	James Campbell - - -	4 -	
9	Francis Maguire - - -	5 -	27	Edward Kane - - -	4 -	
10	Thomas Maguire - - -	2 10	28	Bernard Patson - - -	3 -	
			29	John Abbott - - -	6 10	
			30	Samuel Winterbottom - - -	2 10	
			31	Thomas M'Gann - - -	3 10	
			32	William Feely - - -	3 10	
			33	Anthony Kenney - - -	4 -	
			34	Elizabeth Moncrief - - -	5 10	
			35	Thomas M'Killop - - -	5 -	
			36	John Parks - - -	4 -	
			37	John Ballentine - - -	4 -	
				John Summerville - - -	5 -	
				Alexander Prentice - - -	2 10	

Appendix (G.)

Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.
	Lang's-row :	£. s. d.		Linen Hall-street :	£. s. d.
1	Felix Donnelly	5 - -	1	Joseph Winder	5 10 -
2	Francis Muldoon	5 - -	2	H. Halligan	5 10 -
3	James Downey	5 - -	3	Charles North	5 10 -
4	Curtis Booth	5 - -	4	David Griffith	5 - -
6	Widow Hampden	5 - -	5	William M'Niece	5 - -
			6	William Hughes	6 - -
	Rokeby-green :		7	Thomas Wilson	6 10 -
8	Martha M'Dowell	5 - -	8	John Keenan	5 10 -
	Doctor Colvan	3 - -	9	Charles O'Neill	7 - -
13	Joanahan Briag	6 10 -	10	Mary O'Neill	5 - -
15	Edward Hughes	7 - -	11	Patrick Grimly	6 - -
	Lee M'Kinstry	6 - -	13	Robert Henry	8 10 -
17	Thomas Flakney	5 - -	14	Edward Courtney	8 10 -
18	William M'Kelvy	5 - -		Patrick Graham	4 - -
19	Thomas Smith	5 - -	15	Eleanor O'Neill	9 - -
20	Miss M'Mullan	5 - -	16	Sergeant M'Kelvey	9 - -
21	Clement Jones	5 - -	18	Thomas M'Case	7 10 -
			19	Thomas Treanor	7 10 -
	Dobbin-street :		20	Francis M'Avoy	7 10 -
	Greer & Boyd	9 - -	24	James Enery	6 - -
	Philip Keenan	5 - -	25	Arthur M'Donnell	3 10 -
	William Boyd	3 - -	27	Widow Connolly	3 10 -
			28	John Kerr	1 - -
	Yam-sheds in this Street :		29	M'Catchton & M'Callaghan	6 10 -
1	Thomas Barnett	5 - -	30	Charles North, sen.	5 - -
2	William M'Coem	2 6 2	31	John M'Clure	5 - -
3	Thomas Atwell	2 6 2	32	Same	5 - -
4	James Hume	5 - -		Abbey-lane :	
5	James Allen	2 6 2		Patrick Graham	3 - -
6	John Campbell	2 6 2	2	Merragh M'Court	5 - -
7	John Beatty	2 6 2	3	Francis M'Janet	6 10 -
8	Benjamin Graham	2 6 2	4	John Sloan	5 10 -
9	John Johnson	1 10 -	5	James M'Iver	8 - -
11	John Corrigan	2 6 2	6	Michael Donoghue	1 10 -
12	Ebenezer Rankin	2 6 2	7	Daniel Conlan	1 10 -
13	William Gibson	5 - -	8	John Murray	3 - -
14	John M'Gurk	2 6 2	9	Henry Newbanks	4 - -
15	John M'Alwey	2 6 2	11	John Lynch	1 10 -
16	Patrick Gallagher	2 6 2	12	Patrick Clark	5 - -
17	Samuel Hodge	5 - -	13	Widow Crawley	6 - -
18	James Hughes	2 6 2	14	Patrick Coer	5 - -
19	Daniel Flanigan	5 - -	15	Andrew Campbell	4 - -
20	James Morton	2 6 2	16	Sarah Glover	4 - -
21	James Flanigan	2 6 2	17	James Elliott	5 - -
22	William M'Alce	2 6 2	18	Mrs. Sarsfield	3 10 -
24	George Parks	2 6 2	19	Eliza Gonnill	4 10 -
25	William Craig	2 6 2	20	Patrick Curberry	2 10 -
26	Joshua Brady	2 6 2	22	Thomas Wilton	2 10 -
27	Peter Hughes	2 6 2	24	John Hagan	2 10 -
28	John Brady	5 - -	25	Hugh Feighan	6 - -
29	Patrick Treanor	2 6 2	26	Mary Leemon	5 - -
30	John Gilson	5 - -	27	William Yeunble	6 - -
31	Patrick Gallagher	2 6 2	28	Joseph Robinson	5 - -
32	John M'Clelland	5 - -	29	Hugh Hilland	5 - -
34	James Kerr	1 5 -	31	Bernard Callaghan	6 - -
36	Samuel Hodge	8 - -	32	James M'Clean	6 - -
				Thomas-street :	
	Little Abbey-lane :			Rose Ann Donnelly	8 - -
	Charles Hillock	3 - -		Hugh M'Laughlin	8 - -
	Patrick Gribbin	3 10 -			
	Arthur Donnelly	3 10 -			
	Doctor Gray	1 10 -			
	Thomas Orr	2 - -			
	John Hollywood	3 - -			

No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
	Ogle-street :	£. s.		Irish-street—contd.	£. s.	
5	Michael Lewis - - -	9 -	50	Patrick Kays - - -	1 10	
6	George Taylor - - -	9 -	51	Patrick Keenan - - -	1 10	
50	J. McGuire - - -	6 -	52	Thomas Wainright - - -	2 -	
25	Patrick M'Arle - - -	7 10	53	James M'Thomas - - -	1 -	
26	Peter Grant - - -	9 -	54	Same - - -	1 -	
28	Hugh Donnelly - - -	6 10	55	Bernard M'Cauley - - -	1 10	
30	(Vacant) Mary Trennor - - -	5 -	56	Same - - -	1 -	
31	George Godfrey - - -	5 -	57	Hannah M'Crush - - -	2 -	
32	Same - - -	3 10	58	Leonard Campbell - - -	1 10	
33	Same - - -	3 -	59	William Donnelly - - -	3 -	
35	Francis Conwill - - -	8 -	60	Mrs. Ward - - -	1 -	
36	Peter Donnelly - - -	5 -	50	James M'Arce - - -	5 -	
37	Joseph Mitchell - - -	4 -	61	James Carson - - -	3 10	
38	John Rafferty - - -	3 10	62	Margaret Kearney - - -	1 -	
39	(Vacant) George Godfrey - - -	3 10	63	Mrs. Ward - - -	6 -	
47	James Donnelly - - -	5 -	64	Peter Hagan - - -	5 5	
48	John Quin - - -	5 -	56	Owen M'Veigh - - -	4 4	
54	David Bloomer - - -	8 -	66	John Conway - - -	8 10	
55	James Pearson - - -	3 -	67	Thomas Garland - - -	7 10	
67	James M'Cauley - - -	3 -	58	Terence M'Parlan - - -	7 10	
-	John Sling - - -	3 -	59	Hannah M'Wade - - -	5 10	
58	James M'Carsher - - -	3 -	-	John Gribbin - - -	6 -	
69	Patrick Donnelly - - -	5 -	75	Widow Short - - -	4 10	
	Irish-street :		77	John Wainright - - -	5 -	
5	Patrick Mohan - - -	8 -	79	Jose Callaghan - - -	7 -	
9	Esther Gribbin - - -	3 -	80	Owen Ward - - -	7 -	
10	John Wilson - - -	6 -	81	Thomas Toner - - -	1 -	
12	Christian Dwyer - - -	3 -	83	John Corr - - -	6 -	
13	Mary M'Kee - - -	3 -	90	Bernard Fegan - - -	4 -	
14	John Kelly - - -	3 -	91	Alexander M'Donnell - - -	7 -	
15	Nicholas Locke - - -	3 -	92	Charles M'Kennan - - -	6 -	
16	John Martin - - -	3 -	94	Mrs. M'Garr - - -	8 -	
17	Ann Kearney - - -	3 -	95	Robert Dornan - - -	8 -	
18	William Barton - - -	3 -	95	Bernard M'Laughlin - - -	6 -	
19	Bernard Lynch - - -	3 -	97	Lee Rice - - -	6 -	
20	(Vacant) H. Savage - - -	5 -	99	James Fitzsimmons - - -	6 10	
21	James English - - -	4 -	100	William Hall - - -	8 -	
22	Christopher Ballestine - - -	3 -	102	Henry O'Neill - - -	8 -	
23	John Valleby - - -	5 -	103	John M'Covey - - -	6 -	
26	John Hughes - - -	8 -	104	John Tyrnman - - -	6 -	
28	Thomas Kibbullen - - -	4 -	105	Michael Carroll - - -	5 -	
29	Thomas M'Grath - - -	6 -	106	Michael Lennon - - -	6 -	
30	Same - - -	6 -	108	John Rafferty - - -	6 -	
33	William Rowan - - -	8 -	109	Michael Short - - -	6 -	
34	Arthur M'Donnell - - -	6 -	110	John Wallace - - -	6 -	
35	Margaret Toner - - -	5 -	111	John M'Keown - - -	6 -	
36	John M'Arce - - -	5 -	112	(Vacant) J. H. Wallace - - -	5 -	
37	James M'Laughlin - - -	8 -	114	Edward Neilsen - - -	2 10	
38	Hugh M'Lean - - -	8 -		Moore's Folly, off Irish- street :		
-	James M'Coon - - -	5 -	1	Mary M'Geough - - -	1 -	
39	Edward Moyes - - -	5 -	2	Mary M'Cann - - -	1 -	
-	Edward Connolly, sen. - - -	1 10	3	John Duly - - -	2 -	
43	Bernard Cullen - - -	5 -	4	Jane Robinson - - -	1 10	
44	Mary Gullugly - - -	2 10	5	Mrs. Coulson - - -	1 10	
45	Widow M'Covey - - -	4 -	6	Daniel M'Guigan - - -	1 10	
46	George Keenan - - -	5 10	7	Thomas Quin - - -	1 10	
47	Peter M'Kew - - -	6 10	8	Rose M'Garr - - -	1 10	
48	Owen Rafferty - - -	5 10	9	Jose Lynch - - -	1 10	
49	William Neilson - - -	5 -	10	David Moore - - -	1 10	
			11	Same - - -	1 10	
			12	Ellen M'Mahon - - -	1 -	
			13	Mary Brennan - - -	1 -	
			14	Ann Thompson - - -	1 10	
			15	James Scott - - -	1 10	
			16	David Moore - - -	2 -	

(continued)

Appendix (G.)

Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value	No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.
	Savage's Court, off Irish- street:	£. s.		Primrose-street—continued.	£. s.
1	Robert Diffin - - -	1 - -	36	James Kelly - - -	4 - -
2	Mary M'Donnell - - -	2 - -	37	William Ballentine - - -	4 - -
3	Cathrine Gallagher - - -	2 - -	38	James Corvin - - -	4 - -
4	(Vacant) H. Savage	2 - -	39	Grace Hamilton - - -	4 - -
5	Edward Nixon - - -	2 - -	40	John M'Eldon - - -	4 - -
6	Margaret Woods - - -	2 - -	41	Bernard Cunningham - - -	7 - -
7	(Vacant) H. Savage	2 - -	42	Mrs. Mulholland - - -	6 10
8	Patrick Cunningham - - -	2 - -	43	Alexander Baxter - - -	6 10
9	John M'Kee - - -	2 - -	44	William Hughes - - -	7 10
10	James English - - -	2 - -	45	Margaret Clarke - - -	1 10
	Wilton's Court, off Irish- street:			Charter School-lane:	
1	(Vacant) G. Wilton - - -	1 - -	1	Peter M'Connell - - -	4 - -
2	Mrs. Gibson - - -	1 - -	2	Mary Walsh - - -	4 - -
3	Alexander Cunningham - - -	1 - -	3	Patrick Montague - - -	4 - -
4	George Wilton - - -	1 - -	4	Patrick M'Cann - - -	4 - -
5	Same - - -	1 - -	5	Mrs. G'Hare - - -	4 - -
6	Same - - -	1 - -	6	Thomas M'Parlan - - -	4 - -
	Gallow's Hill, off Irish- street:		8	Thomas Donnelly - - -	6 - -
	Executors of Edw. Carroll	8 - -	10	Ambrose Halligan - - -	6 - -
3	William Dillon - - -	2 10	11	John Golden - - -	6 - -
4	Richard Rogan - - -	2 - -	12	— Magill - - -	6 - -
5	Hugh Donnelly - - -	4 - -	13	Sarah Donnelly - - -	7 - -
6	Charles G'Donnell - - -	3 - -	14	John M'Cann - - -	5 - -
7	(Vacant) Sylvester Quin - - -	1 - -	15	Samuel M'Connell - - -	5 - -
8	Elizabeth M'Covey - - -	2 - -	16	Mrs. Maynes - - -	4 - -
9	Neal Murphy - - -	5 - -	17	Patrick Mooney - - -	5 - -
10	Ann Sweeney - - -	1 - -	18	John M'Parlan - - -	5 - -
	Sylvester Quin - - -	1 10	19	Hugh M'Cartin - - -	5 - -
	Primrose-street:		20	Sarah Kennedy - - -	8 - -
2	John Rice - - -	5 - -	21	William Wilson - - -	5 - -
3	George Rice - - -	5 - -	22	(Vacant) Mrs. Kennedy - - -	4 - -
4	Arthur M'Gman - - -	4 - -	23	James Drummond - - -	4 - -
5	Peter M'Shane - - -	6 10	24	John Clarke - - -	4 - -
6	Robert Garland - - -	6 10	25	Robert Gordon - - -	4 - -
7	John Connolly - - -	5 10	26	Patrick M'Arde - - -	4 - -
8	Charles G'Neil - - -	5 10	27	(Vacant) Mrs. Kennedy - - -	4 - -
9	James Monaghan - - -	5 10	28	Hugh Sweeney - - -	4 - -
10	James M'Kenna - - -	5 - -	29	Thomas Hugghey - - -	6 - -
11	Hugh Cullaghan - - -	5 - -	31	Patrick Maynes - - -	6 10
12	William Longhan - - -	5 - -	32	Cathrine Montague - - -	2 10
13	Felix Burke - - -	5 - -	33	Eleanor Quin - - -	2 10
14	Peter Maguire - - -	5 - -	34	John M'Kenna - - -	4 - -
15	Bernard Lynch - - -	4 - -	35	(Vacant) Sylvester Quin - - -	2 10
16	Michael Coogin - - -	4 - -	36	(Ditto) - ditto - - -	2 10
17	James Ceson - - -	4 - -	37	(Ditto) - ditto - - -	2 10
18	Margaret Kelly - - -	4 - -	38	(Ditto) - ditto - - -	2 10
19	Samuel Kiariston - - -	4 - -	39	Peter Cullen - - -	3 10
20	John Donnelly - - -	4 - -	40	(Vacant) Sylvester Quin - - -	2 10
21	Terence Cullin - - -	4 - -	41	Rose Stewart - - -	3 10
22	Eliza Murphy - - -	4 - -	44	Mrs. Fernham - - -	7 - -
23	John M'Manus - - -	4 - -	45	Mary Collins - - -	3 - -
24	Green M'Caan - - -	4 - -	46	Samuel Gabbin - - -	3 10
25	William Groves - - -	4 - -	47	Mrs. Lynas - - -	3 10
26	William Invm - - -	4 - -	48	Robert Lyle - - -	3 - -
27	John Invis - - -	4 - -	49	Ann Green - - -	3 - -
28	Michael Magill - - -	8 - -	50	John Duncavoy - - -	3 - -
29	Same - - -	6 - -	51	Neal M'Caan - - -	3 - -
30	Archibald M'Donald - - -	6 - -	52	James Hughes - - -	3 - -
31	Same - - -	6 - -	53	John Sheils - - -	3 - -
32	Ellen Hughes - - -	5 - -	54	Benjamin Wood - - -	3 - -
33	Samuel M'Gregor - - -	5 - -	55	Thomas Little - - -	3 - -
34	John Graham - - -	4 - -	56	John Brennan - - -	3 - -
35	Francis Kerr - - -	4 - -	57	(Vacant) John Gillespy - - -	3 - -
			58	Francis M'Collagh - - -	3 - -
			59	James Wilson - - -	3 - -
			60	John Feighan - - -	3 - -
			61	Hugh M'Gurk - - -	3 - -

No.	Inhabitant's Name.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitant's Name.	Yearly Value.	Appendix (G.)
	Charter School-Inne—cont'd.	£. s.		Charter School-Inne—cont'd.	£. s.	Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
62	(Vacant) J. Gillespy	3 -	134	Lawrence Maloney	1 10	
63	Thomas Higgins	3 -	135	Ann Steery	1 10	
64	Cathrine Hughes	3 -	136	John Donnelly	3 10	
65	Patrick M'Glone	3 -				
66	(Vacant) J. Gillespy	3 -		Callan-street:		
67	Margaret Lindsay	3 10	2	Patrick M'Shery	4 -	
	John Gillespy	3 -	3	Hugh Kelly	4 -	
70	John Gillespy	5 -	4	Neal M'Shane	4 -	
73	Andrew Steenson	5 -	5	John M'Dada	4 -	
74	Hugh M'Keown	4 -	6	John Norton	1 -	
76	Thomas Jeffers	3 -	7	Andrew Appleton	3 -	
76	James Shephard	3 -	8	John Norton	4 -	
77	Thomas Archer	6 -	9	Michael Quin	3 -	
79	(Vacant) Thomas Orr	1 -	10	Charles M'Glading	2 -	
80	Thomas Watson	1 10	11	John Grimes	3 10	
81	John Campbell	2 -	12	George O'Neill	6 -	
82	David Orr	3 -	13	John M'Canley	4 -	
83	Alexander Totten	1 10	14	Hamilton Martin	1 -	
84	John Kearney	1 10	15	William Paterson	4 -	
85	John M'Fadden	8 -	16	Ellen Kennedy	3 -	
86	James Carlow	7 -	17	Mary M'Fes	3 -	
87	Mrs. Johnson	7 10	18	Anthony Haslon	3 -	
89	Francis Hoy	6 10	19	Eliza Page	3 -	
90	Hugh Moore	6 10	20	John Murray	4 -	
91	(Vacant) J. Davidson	6 10	21	John Brown	6 10	
	John Davidson	4 -	22	Michael M'Court	8 -	
92	Mary Harvey	6 10	23	(Vacant) John Davidson	6 -	
93	Robert O'Neill	6 10	24	Margaret Connolly	6 -	
	Edward M'Cluskey	6 10	25	Patrick Delany	4 -	
96	James Bradley	6 10	26	Susan Conlon	4 -	
97	Patrick Loughran	5 -	27	William Lynas	4 -	
98	Sarah Murray	5 -	28	Bernard M'Ardie	4 -	
99	Bernard Donnelly	6 10	29	(Vacant) Thos. Johnson	1 10	
100	Daniel M'Kurker	6 -	30	Francis Campbell	5 -	
101	James M'Cube	7 10	31	— Brown	5 -	
102	Matthew Hoy	6 -	32	Ellen Bigham	4 -	
103	John Walsh	8 -	33	James Quin	6 -	
	William Brawley	7 -	34	Eliza Hogg	6 -	
105	Richard Carpendale	7 -	35	Edward M'Gaugan	8 -	
106	Patrick Fegan	6 10	36	James M'Connell	2 10	
107	John M'Connell	6 -	37	(Vacant) J. M'Conn	2 10	
108	John M'Caiffy	6 10	38	Henry Sing, jun.	8 -	
109	Bridget Logan	4 -	39	Henry Killpatrick	2 -	
110	John M'Call	6 -	40	James Robinson	2 -	
111	William M'Kenna	7 10	41	Bernard Gornall	2 -	
112	Arthur Hobbs	6 -	42	Owen Trodden	2 -	
113	Jane Corasa	6 -	43	Henry Watson	5 -	
114	Robert Bryan	6 -	44	(Vacant) James Glass	5 -	
115	Margaret M'Keena	4 -	45	Ann Maget	3 -	
116	Margaret Quin	6 -	46	Mary Farrell	3 10	
117	James Fitzsimmons	4 -	47	John Dougan	3 -	
			48	John Kerr	3 -	
119	James Coaly	4 -	49	John Morrow	4 -	
120	John M'Keena	4 -	50	John O'Neill	4 -	
121	Mary Fox	1 -	51	Daniel M'Coy	4 -	
122	George Hughes	1 -	52	Lavinia Robinson	4 -	
123	Patrick Fox	1 -	53	Henry Williamson	4 -	
124	P. M'Avinchey	6 -	54	Anthony Dougan	4 -	
125	William Carson	6 -	55	John Kerr	1 10	
126	(Vacant) Thos. M'Avinchey	5 -	56	David Moffet	5 -	
127	John Golden	5 -	57	James Rice	4 -	
128	Thomas M'Cullagh	5 10	58	Thomas Garland	4 -	
	Alexander M'Donald	5 10	59	John Holland	5 -	
129	Owen Cassidy	1 -	60	Mrs. Lynas	5 -	
131	Mary Donnelly	1 10	61	William Marley	5 -	
132	John M'Ardell	1 10	62	Mary Ann Balfour	6 -	
133	Michael Breen	1 10	63	Sauzel M'Gashly	4 -	

(continued)

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.	No.	Inhabitants' Names.	Yearly Value.
	Callan-street—continued.	£. s.		Cottage-court—cont'd.	£. s.
68	John Reid - - -	4 -	4	Francis Walsh - - -	2 10
69	James M'Kenna - - -	2 -	5	John Holland - - -	2 10
70	William Carson - - -	2 10	6	Daniel Trodden - - -	2 10
71	Michael Douglas - - -	2 -	7	Widow Clements - - -	2 10
72	Thomas Foster - - -	5 -	8	Letitia M'Thomas - - -	2 10
73	James Robinson - - -	3 10	9	Mary Irwin - - -	2 10
74	Samuel Brawley - - -	7 10	10	Mary Mallard - - -	2 10
75	Alexander Bailenune - - -	7 10	11	Denise Leary - - -	5 -
76	Thomas Cunningham - - -	6 10	12	Thomas Tonner - - -	2 10
77	John M'Kusker - - -	6 10	13	Wilson Murray - - -	5 -
78	Arnell O'Hanlon - - -	6 -			
	Peter Delany - - -	3 -		Callan-street-lane :	
79	Phillip Burke - - -	6 -	1	James Neal - - -	4 -
80	James Jackson - - -	2 10	-	John Keay - - -	3 -
81	Bernard Donnelly - - -	2 10	2	John M'Kenna - - -	5 -
82	David Holmes - - -	2 10	3	William Magge - - -	3 -
83	John Darragh - - -	2 10	4	James Culha - - -	3 10
85	Robert Bloomfield - - -	2 10	5	(Vacant) J. Jackson	2 -
87	Mrs. Monaghan - - -	3 -	6	(Ditto) Syl. Quin	1 -
88	Hugh Caffrey - - -	2 10	7	(Ditto) - ditto	1 -
89	James Stitt - - -	2 10	8	(Ditto) - ditto	1 -
90	(Vacant) N. Hutchinson	1 -	9	(Ditto) - ditto	1 -
91	(Ditto) - ditto	1 10	10	(Ditto) - ditto	1 -
92	James Courtney - - -	5 -	11	Francis M'Collagh - - -	4 -
93	John Duffey - - -	1 -	12	(Vacant) J. Jackson	4 -
94	William M'Ginn - - -	3 -	-	Peter Delany - - -	10 -
95	John Norton - - -	3 -	-	James M'Caugan - - -	3 -
96	John M'Anerspary - - -	2 -	-	Thomas Healy - - -	1 -
			-	Nicholas Hutchinson	1 -
	Callan-row :		-	Mrs. Jackson - - -	4 -
1	Justice & Tarkington	6 -	13	John Simpson - - -	5 -
2	William M'Caraher - - -	6 -	14	Allen M'Donald - - -	8 -
3	(Vacant) J. Ferguson	6 -	15	Mrs. Cherry - - -	2 -
4	John Quin - - -	5 10	16	John M'Farland - - -	5 -
5	John M'Caraher - - -	5 10	17	(Vacant) J. Jackson	3 -
6	Mary Lappen - - -	5 10	18	Laurence Collins - - -	3 -
7	Henry Miller - - -	5 10	19	Hugh O'Neill - - -	4 10
8	James M'Laughlin - - -	6 10	20	Daniel Spellman - - -	3 -
9	Robert Murray - - -	5 10	21	Owen Quin - - -	3 -
10	John Deany - - -	6 -	22	James Hagan - - -	3 -
12	William Graham - - -	3 10	23	John M'Connell - - -	3 -
			24	James Duffey - - -	5 -
	Cottage-court :		25	Patrick M'Guire - - -	6 -
1	Thomas M'Creesh - - -	2 10			
2	Thomas Boyle - - -	2 10		The King's Barnacks :	
3	Peter M'Kenna - - -	2 10	1	Sergeant Hughes - - -	5 -

RECAPITULATION of the Streets and Number of Houses under £.10 Value.

Streets.	Number of Houses.	Streets.	Number of Houses.
Lower English-street - - -	83	Grew's-entry - - -	1
Upper English-street - - -	2	Mill-street - - -	10
Bond-brook - - -	14	Dawson-street - - -	22
Wood's-entry - - -	2	Abbey-street - - -	21
Kelly's-gateway - - -	1	College-street - - -	1
Magge's-entry - - -	2	Jenny's-row - - -	13
Kelly's-court - - -	14	Market-street - - -	19
M'Elroy's-entry - - -	3	Church-lane - - -	17
Devlin's-row - - -	6	Vicar's-hill - - -	5
M'Elroy's-row - - -	13	Quin's-row - - -	3
Pmctor's-entry - - -	1	Castle-street - - -	45
Essally-lane - - -	10	Ross-lane - - -	8
Lyle's-gateway - - -	1	Chapel-lane - - -	30
Meeting-house-gateway - - -	2	Sling's-entry - - -	2

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FICTITIOUS VOTES, IRELAND.

[191

Streets.	Number of Houses.	Streets.	Number of Houses.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
Scotch-street - - - -	1	Irish-street - - - -	79	
Bullinson's entry - - -	3	Moore's Folly - - - -	16	
M'Crum's-lane - - - -	10	Savage's-court - - - -	10	
Palace-row - - - - -	9	Wilton's-court - - - -	6	
Little Barrack-street	15	Gallows-bill - - - -	8	
Barrack-hill - - - - -	18	Primrose-street - - -	44	
Barrack Well-lane - - -	37	Charter School-lane - -	123	
Lang's-cow - - - - -	5	Calvin-street - - - -	84	
Rohoby-green - - - - -	8	Cullin-row - - - - -	11	
Dobbin-street - - - - -	32	Cottage-court - - - -	13	
Linen Hall-street - - -	26	Cullin-street-lane - - -	25	
Abbey-lane - - - - -	18	The King's Barracks, Canteen of	1	
Thomas-street - - - - -	2			
Ogle-street - - - - -	22			
		TOTAL - - - - -	996	

Arranagh, 31 March 1837.

Wm. M'Williams, Chairman.
Patrick Gribbin, Clerk.

BANDON BRIDGE.

No estimate or valuation, either under the provisions of the Act 9 Geo. 4, c. 82, or of any local or private Acts, or otherwise, has been returned to or deposited with me, nor is any such estimate or valuation in my custody as town-clerk, wherefore, I am unable from any official document to make the return required; but I have procured, and herewith annex, a copy of the estimate or valuation, made by valuers appointed by the commissioners acting at Bandon Bridge aforesaid, under the provisions of the Act of 9 Geo. 4, c. 82, of the town of Bandon Bridge aforesaid, and to the local extent of the suburbs thereof, to which the jurisdiction of said commissioners extends; but beyond such local extent as to such suburbs, and within the limits of said borough as determined by the Boundary Act, are many valuable houses and premises, not inserted or included in the said estimate or valuation, as not being within the jurisdiction of the said commissioners under the said Act.

19 April 1837.

Edward Doherty, Town Clerk.

Number of each Street.	Name of Street and of each Occupier.	Estimated Annual Value.	Number of each House.	Name of Street and of each Occupier.	Estimated Annual Value.
	North Main-street.	£. s.		North Main-street—contd.	£. s.
1	J. J. Thomson - - - -	42 -	27	Margaret Giles - - - -	—
2	Robert Baker - - - -	13 -	28	David Bush - - - - -	6 -
3	Edward Murphy - - - -	18 -	29	Richard Topham - - - -	6 -
4	Jonathan Clarke, M.D. -	45 -	30	John Palmer - - - - -	16 -
5	William Lovell - - - -	30 -	31	Mary Appelbe - - - - -	22 -
6	William Hunter - - - -	24 -	32	Dora Kingston - - - -	45 -
7	John Sweic - - - - -	52 -	33	Timothy Murphy - - - -	28 -
8	Anne Clerke - - - - -	16 -	34	Anne Swantos - - - - -	16 -
9	Anne Joyce - - - - -	14 -	35	Edward O'Brien - - - -	30 -
10	Thomas Hornbrook - - -	11 -	36	Richard Hayes - - - - -	20 -
11	Mary Rutledge - - - -	11 -	37	Thomas Barber - - - - -	22 -
12	James Morgan - - - - -	18 -	38	Eleanor Austin - - - - -	22 -
13	William Sloane - - - -	16 -	39	Lydia Hegarty - - - - -	22 -
14	James Craig - - - - -	14 -	40	James Dawson - - - - -	15 -
15	Anne Ford - - - - -	15 -	41	Mary Travers - - - - -	30 -
16	John Murphy - - - - -	9 -	42	John Popham - - - - -	30 -
17	John Deamond - - - - -	9 -	43	Paul Williams - - - - -	65 -
18	Benjamin Forde - - - -	15 -	44	James Connor - - - - -	11 -
19	William Turpin - - - -	12 -	45	William Belcher, M.D. - -	30 -
20	James Hurley - - - - -	14 -	46	Henry Baldwin - - - - -	20 -
21	William Shine - - - - -	16 -	47	Catherine Donovan - - -	15 -
22	Martha Jenkins - - - -	16 -	48	James Dixon - - - - -	15 -
23	William House - - - - -	18 -	49	Mary Baldwin - - - - -	20 -
24	John Williams - - - - -	17 -	50	Margaret Long - - - - -	20 -
25	William Barry - - - - -	16 -	51	Susan Wright - - - - -	15 -
26	William Lison - - - - -	7 -	52	Michael M'Carthy - - - -	12 -

(continued)

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

Number of each House,	Name of Street and of each Occupant.	Estimated Annual Value.	Number of each House,	Name of Street and of each Occupant.	Estimated Annual Value.
	North Main-street—cont ^d .	£. s.		Kilbeggan-street :	£. s.
53	Charles Teulon - - -	55 -	1	John Donohue - - -	9 -
54	John Teulon - - -	28 -	2	Ellen Sexton - - -	—
55	Isaac Biggs - - -	28 -	3	Mary Calenn - - -	—
56	Zechariah Hawkes - -	27 -	4	John Desmond, jun. -	—
	George Cornwall's store -	10 -	5	John Desmond, sen. -	7 -
57	Andrew Moore - - -	11 -	6	Jeremiah Discol. - -	—
58	Rev. William Sawart - -	22 -	7	Jane Hingston. - - -	—
59	Anne Scully - - -	13 -	8	James Hegan. - - -	—
60	Richard Williams - - -	15 -	9	John Murphy. - - -	—
61	Henrietta Hornbrook - -	22 -	10	Elizabeth Hayes - - -	5 -
62	Robert T. Belcher - - -	30 -	11	Robert Topham - - -	5 -
63	Rizabeth Jenkins - - -	14 -	12	John Collins. - - -	—
64	Mary Hornbrook - - -	18 -	13	Timothy Desmond. -	—
65	William McCreight - - -	15 -	14	Daniel Callaghan - -	8 -
66	Susan Popham - - -	15 -	15	James Stoford. - - -	—
67	Rev. W. R. Moleworth - -	20 -	16	Mary Cuisane - - -	7 -
68	Anne Gonne - - -	25 -	17	Maskelyne Alcock - -	8 -
69	Anne Jenkins - - -	16 -	18	James Bourke - - -	8 -
70	Anne Penrose - - -	18 -	19	Daniel M'Carby - - -	7 -
71	John Tresilian - - -	35 -	20	Michael Murphy. - -	—
72	— - - - -	—	21	Maskelyne Alcock. -	—
73	George Lonoe, M.D. - - -	50 -	22	John Long. - - -	—
74	Franklin Baldwin - - -	28 -	23	William Hammett. - -	—
75	Margaret Hornbrook - -	34 -	24	William Brady. - - -	—
76	Rebecca Williams - - -	18 -	25	— - - - -	—
77	William Topham - - -	12 -		Watergate-street :	
78	John W. Lindsay - - -	26 -		Matthew Parrott - - -	13 -
79	John Wheeler - - -	35 -	1	William Bearliby - - -	6 -
80	Denis Murry - - -	14 -	2	William Cronn. - - -	—
81	— - - - -	—	3	— - - - -	—
82	James White - - -	15 -	4	— - - - -	—
83	Edward Toole - - -	28 -	5	— - - - -	14 -
84	Daniel M'Carthy - - -	14 -	6	William Smith - - -	14 -
85	Denis Ruin - - -	10 -	7	John Lovell, ten-yard -	35 -
86	John Tanner - - -	10 -	8	Thomas Payne. - - -	—
87	Henry Lane - - -	14 -	9	Patrick Donovan. - -	—
88	Robert Fuller - - -	22 -	10	John Sheehan. - - -	—
89	Thomas Montjoy - - -	16 -	11	James Sullivan. - - -	—
90	Robert Clarke - - -	15 -	12	Arthur Leary. - - -	—
91	— - - - -	—	13	William C. Sullivan, yard	12 -
92	George Harris - - -	35 -	14	Jeremiah Collins. - -	—
93	Henry Plesce - - -	15 -	15	Daniel Holland. - - -	—
94	Edward Keilber. - - -	—	16	William Sullivan, stable.	—
95	William C. Sullivan. - -	—	17	Ditto - store. - - -	—
96	Maurice Ahern - - -	13 -	18	— - - - -	—
97	Edward Hornbrook - - -	10 -	19	Patrick Crowley. - - -	—
98	Jonathan Clarke, M. D. -	6 -	20	George and William Corn-	300 -
	— - - - -	—	21	wall's brewery. - - -	—
	Bridge-place :		22	— - - - -	—
1	William Sullivan - - -	36 -	23	James Morris. - - -	—
2	William C. Sullivan - - -	32 -	24	Patrick Foley. - - -	—
	— - - - -	—	25	Constance O'Dell - - -	20 -
	Cavendish-row :		26	William Hunter - - -	18 -
1	John Cotter - - -	20 -	27	Rev. George Stephenson -	14 -
2	Maurice Scollard - - -	15 -	28	William Berne. - - -	—
3	Timothy Murphy - - -	—	29	William Murphy. - - -	—
4	Richard Lison - - -	15 -	30	Gervase Lee. - - -	—
5	John Cotter - - -	10 -	31	Denis Sullivan. - - -	—
	— - - - -	—	32	Mary Beunish. - - -	—
	Devonshire-square :		33	James Tobin. - - -	—
1	John Bennish, M.D. - - -	40 -	34	Daniel Regan. - - -	—
2	Abraham Lane - - -	35 -	35	Timothy Flynn. - - -	—
3	— - - - -	—	36	William Sullivan, ten-yard	25 -
4	Rev. John Browne - - -	80 -	37	Wm. C. Sullivan, ten-yard	22 -
5	— - - - -	—	38	— - - - -	6 -
	— - - - -	—	39	Joseph Duke - - -	6 -
	— - - - -	—	40	— - - - -	—

Number of each House.	Name of Street and of each Occupier.	Estimated Annual Value.	Number of each House.	Name of Street and of each Occupier.	Estimated Annual Value.	Appendix (G.)
						Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
	Watergate-street—cont ^d .	£. s.		South Main-street—cont ^d .	£. s.	
41	John Lynch - - -	6 -	5	John Lorton - - -	40 -	
42	John Field - - -	—	6	George Bennett - - -	35 -	
43	Murphy Comer. - - -	—	7	Elizabeth Moxley - - -	15 -	
44	William Lee. - - -	—	8	Michael Shaw - - -	14 -	
45	Walter Joyce. - - -	—	9	Robert Edwards - - -	40 -	
46	Benjamin Thompson - - -	16 -	10	Wm. St. John Jagoe - - -	40 -	
47	Jeremiah Mahony. - - -	—	11	Alice Fisher - - -	24 -	
48	—	—	12	Richard Dowden - - -	60 -	
49	Jeremiah M'Carthy. - - -	—	13	John Whiting - - -	16 -	
50	William Joyce - - -	7 -	14	Michael Moriarty - - -	17 -	
51	Herbert Turpin. - - -	—	15	Thomas Donegan - - -	18 -	
52	John Lees. - - -	—	16	Joseph Scanley - - -	35 -	
53	George Knowles. - - -	—	17	Robert Starkey - - -	28 -	
54	Margaret Turpin. - - -	—	18	Nicholas Drew - - -	15 -	
55	William Lee. - - -	—	19	Richard Treilian - - -	42 -	
56	William Brook - - -	7 -	20	Jeremiah O'Brien - - -	30 -	
57	Samuel Lee - - -	8 -	21	John Sloan - - -	32 -	
58	Robert Rogers - - -	15 -	22	John Cooney - - -	17 -	
59	Sarah Newcott - - -	10 -	23	Stephen Elms - - -	17 -	
60	Catherine Goetval - - -	11 -	24	George Sutton - - -	30 -	
61	Jeremiah Crowley. - - -	—	25	George Harris - - -	35 -	
62	William Morgan. - - -	—	26	William Baker - - -	40 -	
63	Timothy Driscoll. - - -	—	27	James Stanley - - -	33 -	
	—	—	28	James Scott - - -	70 -	
	Mill-place :		29	Thomas Bennett - - -	40 -	
1	Jacob and John Biggs - - -	40 -	30	Thomas M. Sloane - - -	20 -	
2	Mill of ditto - - -	300 -	31	Arthur B. Bernard - - -	18 -	
	—	—	32	Anne Brangan & R. Joyce - - -	25 -	
	Bedwell-lane :		33	John W. Sullivan - - -	30 -	
1	William Belcher, M. D. - - -	—	34	John Richardson - - -	12 -	
2	Henry Baldwin. - - -	—	35	John Marshall - - -	27 -	
3	William Belcher, M. D. - - -	—	36	John Clarke - - -	30 -	
4	Ditto. - - -	—	37	Francis Hayes, M. D. - - -	14 -	
5	Benjamin Forde. - - -	—	38	William Lovell - - -	8 -	
6	Ditto. - - -	—	39	Daniel Murphy - - -	70 -	
	North Church-lane :		40	Ch. and Wm. Dowden - - -	9 -	
1	Edward O'Brien. - - -	—	41	Jeremiah Maher & Son - - -	14 -	
2	Henry Howe. - - -	—	42	Robert Allmon - - -	12 -	
3	Richard Hayes. - - -	—	43	Charlotte Flynn - - -	5 -	
4	Thomas Barter. - - -	—	44	John Munnac - - -	—	
5	Edward O'Brien. - - -	—	45	Julian Donovan - - -	6 -	
6	J. Lovell, & Edw. Murphy. - - -	—	46	George Giles - - -	6 -	
7	Mary Lane & Murthy Hare. - - -	—	47	William Grinley - - -	14 -	
8	Don Kingdon. - - -	—	48	William Richardson - - -	12 -	
9	Mary Mahony. - - -	—	49	Rev. Armiger Scaly - - -	12 -	
10	Henry Howe. - - -	—	50	Abraham Isaac - - -	8 -	
11	Timothy Murphy. - - -	—	51	James Farrell - - -	30 -	
12	Anne Swanton. - - -	—	52	Thomas Fuller - - -	8 -	
	—	—	53	Timothy Foley - - -	9 -	
	River-lane :		54	Elizabeth Mulholland - - -	10 -	
1	Robert Good. - - -	—	55	John Atkins - - -	10 -	
2	James White. - - -	—	56	Denis Manry - - -	—	
3	Robert Good. - - -	—	57	—	7 -	
4	William Shelton. - - -	—	58	Joseph Roycroft - - -	11 -	
5	John Wheeler. - - -	—	59	Edward Hickey - - -	10 -	
6	Michael Burley. - - -	—	60	Mary Donovan - - -	8 -	
7	Andrew Burley. - - -	—	61	Michael Shaw - - -	—	
8	James White. - - -	—	62	William Maslin. - - -	30 -	
9	Ditto. - - -	—	63	William Gash - - -	14 -	
10	Edward Toole. - - -	—	64	Mary Wheeler - - -	14 -	
	—	—	65	—	9 -	
	South Main-street :		66	Thomas Seymour - - -	11 -	
1	Robert Wheeler - - -	32 -	67	Thomas Sloane - - -	45 -	
2	Mary O'Connor - - -	32 -	68	Edward Doherty - - -	48 -	
3	Michael P. England - - -	46 -	69	Thomas Beemish - - -	38 -	
4	John Bond - - -	—	70	Joseph T. Wheeler - - -	14 -	
	—	—	71	Michael Hayes - - -	—	

(continues)

Appendix (G.)
 Houses in Towns
 which return
 Members to Par-
 liament.

Number of each House.	Name of Street and of each Occupant.	Estimated Annual Value.	Number of each House.	Name of Street and of each Occupant.	Estimated Annual Value.
	South Main-street—contd.	£. s.		Hill-street—continued.	£. s.
72	Henry Henale - - -	35 - -	7	John Waugh - - -	6 - -
73	Silvanus Robinson - - -	35 - -	8	Daniel Coughlane - - -	6 - -
74	Anne Sweeney - - -	15 - -	9	John Cress - - -	- - -
75	John Fawcitt - - -	18 - -	10	John Ford - - -	- - -
76	James Edwards - - -	30 - -	11	Denis Donovan - - -	- - -
77	William G. Allman - - -	40 - -	12	William Peyton - - -	- - -
78	John Splaine - - -	10 - -	13	Mary Quinn - - -	- - -
79	Edward Fawcitt - - -	24 - -	14	Edward Morris - - -	5 - -
80	Jane Evans - - -	28 - -	15	John Mulholland - - -	5 - -
81	John O'Brien - - -	25 - -	16	George Sullivan - - -	7 - -
82	Richard O'Sullivan - - -	30 - -			
83	Anne Dowden - - -	18 - -		Castle-street:	
84	William Pope - - -	35 - -		John Stanton - - -	33 - -
85	William Moriarty - - -	32 - -	1	Catherine Murphy - - -	18 - -
86	Eugene O'Sullivan - - -	25 - -	2	Michael Falvey - - -	25 - -
87	Henry Joyce - - -	24 - -	3	Eliza Sullivan - - -	18 - -
88	Jane Mahony - - -	30 - -	4	Denis Galvin - - -	22 - -
89	George French - - -	40 - -	5	- - - - -	13 - -
90	Thomas Morris - - -	16 - -	6	- - - - -	28 - -
91	John Crowley - - -	22 - -	7	Joseph Bennett - - -	10 - -
92	Stewart Treafan - - -	50 - -	8	James Roberson - - -	- - -
93	John McCae - - -	32 - -	9	Daniel Mahony - - -	- - -
94	Edward Carroll - - -	28 - -	10	Daniel Kearney - - -	- - -
95	Ellen Quinlan - - -	35 - -	11	- - - - -	11 - -
96	James Palmer - - -	35 - -	12	John Brion - - -	5 - -
97	William Welpley - - -	25 - -	13	Robert Bond Gough - - -	5 - -
98	William Bullen - - -	30 - -	14	William Baily - - -	7 - -
99	Edward Appibbe - - -	30 - -	15	James Donohue - - -	11 - -
100	James McCarthy - - -	15 - -	16	John Neal - - -	10 - -
101	Mary Anne Skuse - - -	22 - -	17	Thomas Merry - - -	- - -
	Castle-road:			Bridge-street:	
1	Daniel Carol - - -	8 - -		James Fitzgerald - - -	12 - -
2	George Roche - - -	14 - -	1	William Hart - - -	23 - -
3	Rosanna McCarthy - - -	16 - -	2	James Leary - - -	18 - -
4	David Roycroft - - -	7 - -	3	John Shine - - -	26 - -
5	Patrick Hickey - - -	8 - -	4	John Hunter - - -	30 - -
6	Thomas Wrener - - -	- - -	5	Henry Belcher - - -	42 - -
7	Jonathan Bece - - -	7 - -	6	George Perrott - - -	36 - -
8	Patrick Barry - - -	9 - -	7	James Lebane - - -	12 - -
9	Jeremiah Connelly - - -	8 - -	8	Richard Bright - - -	24 - -
10	John Sullivan - - -	6 - -	9	Robert Wheeler - - -	- - -
11	James Cahan - - -	6 - -	10	Thomas Murray - - -	20 - -
12	John Densly - - -	6 - -	11	Mary Lonne - - -	14 - -
13	John Slattery - - -	- - -	12	Justin McCarthy - - -	26 - -
14	Rev. Bold C. Hill - - -	16 - -	13	John Byron - - -	20 - -
15	Thomas Hill - - -	18 - -	14	Joseph Moxley - - -	9 - -
16	- - - - -	8 - -	15	Timothy Carty - - -	9 - -
17	Samuel Gornell - - -	8 - -	16	James Good - - -	18 - -
18	Timothy Brien - - -	5 - -	17	George Allman - - -	23 - -
19	James Allen - - -	12 - -	18	Samuel Seymour - - -	14 - -
20	- - - - -	- - -	19		
21	Timothy Burke - - -	5 - -		Weir-street:	
22	Daniel Desmond - - -	- - -		Francis Hayes, M. D. - - -	- - -
	Wesley-quay:			Ditto - - -	- - -
1	Rev. William Rielly - - -	14 - -	1	Roche Hayes - - -	- - -
2	George Allman - - -	- - -	2	Ditto - - -	- - -
3	Paul Williams - - -	- - -	3	Ditto - - -	- - -
4	Daniel Callaghan - - -	12 - -	4	Ditto - - -	- - -
	Hill-street:			Cotter Bride - - -	- - -
1	George Steadfast - - -	5 - -	5	Matthew Buckley - - -	- - -
2	W. H. Kingston's brewery - - -	50 - -	6	Catherine Scaly - - -	12 - -
3	William H. Kingston - - -	30 - -	7	Ditto - - -	- - -
4	Thomas Weekes - - -	7 - -	8	Cotter Bride - - -	- - -
5	- - - - -	10 - -	9	Matthew Buckley - - -	- - -
6	George Dempster - - -	9 - -	10	Ditto - - -	- - -
				John Clerke - - -	- - -

Number of each House.	Name of Street and of each Occupant.	Estimated Annual Value.	Number of each House.	Name of Street and of each Occupant.	Estimated Annual Value.	Appendix (G.)
						Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
	Cavendish-quay:	£. s.		South Church-lane:	£. s.	
1	George and James Pope -	50 -	1	William Driscoll.	—	
2			2	Michael Donovan.	—	
3			3	Henry Hawkes.	—	
4	Robert Morris - - -	8 -	4	John Murphy.	—	
5	Henry Lane - - -	8 -	5	Daniel Griffith.	—	
6	James Smith - - -	8 -	6	Michael Shean.	—	
7	Thomas Elms - - -	20 -	7	Denis Murray.	—	
8	Edmond Hunt - - -	14 -	8	Thomas Sherlock.	—	
9	John Coleman - - -	14 -				
10	Eliza Aickin - - -	14 -		Bridge-lane:		
11	Jane Tresilian - - -	14 -	1	John Stanton - - -	20 -	
12	Dora Tresilian - - -	14 -	2	Richard Justice - - -	6 -	
13	John Wherry - - -	12 -	3	John Stanton - - -	6 -	
14	Patrick Cotter - - -	15 -	4	John Humphreys - - -	20 -	
15	Catherine Busted - - -	15 -	5	Jane Swanton - - -	20 -	
16	Anne Sweeney - - -	18 -	6	Ditto.	—	
17	Elian Allam - - -	13 -	7	Ditto.	—	
18	John Desmond - - -	10 -	8	Mary Harding.	—	
19	Richard Cole - - -	10 -	9	Robert Lane.	—	
20	Cornelius Mahony & Jane Donovan.	10 -	10	Edward Anderson.	—	
21	Richard Cole - - -	18 -	11	Samuel Creech.	—	
22	James Hamilton - - -	22 -	12	Robert Morris.	—	
23	Rev. N. C. Bowen - - -	22 -	13	Mary Clarke.	—	
24	Frederick Mayne - - -	22 -	14	Cornelius Halshane.	—	
25	E. M. Dacre - - -	22 -	15	James Mahony.	—	
26	James Orr - - -	6 -	16	Thomas Olive.	—	
27	Denis Holand - - -	6 -	17	Daniel Leary.	—	
28	Anne Scott.	—	17½	John Swanton - - -	9 -	
29	Ralph Peyton.	—	18	John Magrath.	—	
30	Mary Perkins.	—	19	Joseph Hawkes.	—	
31	Marianne Fitzgerald	—	20	Edward Appelbe.	—	
32	Ditto - - - - -	130 -	21	Timothy Flynn.	—	
33	Jerry Sullivan - - -	7 -	22	Catherine Brien.	—	
34	Cornelius Driscoll.	—	23	James McCarthy.	—	
35	Edward Barry.	—	24	Mary Anne Skuse.	—	
36	Thomas Condell.	—		Market-quay:		
37	Daniel McCarthy.	—	1	Back passage to four houses.	—	
38	Ellen Murphy - - -	10 -	2	Silvanus Robinson.	—	
39	Richard Hunt - - -	5 -	3	William G. Allman.	—	
40	Daniel Walsh.	—	4	Ditto - - - - -	15 -	
40½	Michael Kearney.	—	5	Jeremiah Sullivan.	—	
41	John Mahony - - -	7 -	5	John O'Brien.	—	
42	William Gash.	—	6	Richard Sullivan.	—	
43	Thomas Beannah and Edward Doherty.	—	7	Anne Dowdon.	—	
44	Joseph Thomas Wheeler.	—	8	William Moriarty.	—	
45	Henry Hesale.	—	9	William Pope.	—	
			10	Eugene O'Sullivan.	—	
			11	Henry Joyce.	—	
			12	Jane Mahony.	—	
	Church-street:		13	William Gash - - -	12 -	
1	John Haies.	—	14	George Harris.	—	
2	Richard Gabriel.	—	15	John Crowley.	—	
3	Thomas Tape.	—	16	Stewart Tresilian.	—	
4	—	—	17	John McCue & Ed. Carroll.	—	
5	John Cress.	—	18	Eliza Quinn.	—	
6	John Cress.	—	19	Stewart Tresilian - - -	8 -	
7	Michael Sheehan.	—	20	William Wellfly.	—	
8	Joseph Brangan.	—	21	Timothy Murry.	—	
9	Joseph Buckannon.	—	22	William Bailen.	—	
10	Robert Conroy.	—	23			
11	John Bassett.	—		Market-street:		
12	Daniel Sullivan.	—	1	Honora Coughlane - - -	12 -	
13	Arthur Green.	—	2	John Condon - - -	12 -	
14	Joseph Alworth.	—	3	Nathaniel Sutton - - -	12 -	
15	William Webb.	—	4	Daniel Dineen - - -	12 -	
16	Richard Shorten.	—	5	Silvanus Robinson.	—	
17	John Fitzgerald.	—	6	Ditto.	—	
18	Richard Harris.	—	7	Ditto.	—	

(continued)

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Town
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

Number of each House.	Name of Street and of each Occupant.	Estimated Annual Value.	Number of each House.	Name of Street and of each Occupant.	Estimated Annual Value.
	Hospital-lane :	£. s.		Warner's-lane—cont^d.	£. s.
1	Jeremiah Murnane.	—	14	—	—
2	Isaac Brangan.	—	15	Hospital.	—
3	John Foley.	—	16	Edward Sweeney.	—
4	John Wheeler - - -	10 -	17	Edward Sweeney.	—
	—	—	18	George Dowden - - -	24 -
	—	—	19	Ditto - - - - -	—
	—	—		Shannon-street :	
	—	—	1	James Fitzpatrick - - -	16 -
	Bright's-lane :		2	Catherine Falvey - - -	18 -
1	James Smith.	—	3	Edward Hurst.	—
2	Benjamin Henale.	—	4	Catherine Murray - - -	7 -
3	Richard Bright.	—	5	Robert Falvey - - -	34 -
4	Thomas Elms.	—	6	John Lyons - - - - -	9 -
	Burlington-quay :		7	William Starkey - - -	12 -
1	William Hoyt.	—	8	Thomas Bennett - - -	14 -
2	John Shine.	—	9	Anne Cronin - - - - -	12 -
3	John Hester.	—	10	John Murphy - - - - -	12 -
4	Ditto.	—	11	Patrick Buckley - - -	12 -
5	Henry Belcher.	—	12	Thomas Barry - - - - -	28 -
6	Michael P. England.	—	13	William Skuse - - - - -	12 -
7	John Lordan.	—	14	Daniel Fitzpatrick - - -	10 -
8	John Crowley - - -	8 -	15	Jerry Sullivan - - - - -	10 -
9	George Bennett.	—	16	- - - - -	10 -
10	Elizabeth Moxley.	—	17	- - - - -	10 -
11	Michael Shaw.	—	18	John O'Neil - - - - -	9 -
12	Robert Edwards.	—	19	Thomas Falvey - - - - -	33 -
13	Ditto.	—	20	Benjamin Thomas - - -	28 -
14	William St. John Jagoe.	—	21	Denis M'Carthy - - - -	10 -
15	Ditto.	—	22	George Hart - - - - -	10 -
16	Alice Fisher.	—	23	Bartholomew Donovan - -	10 -
17	Richard Dowden.	—	24	Giles Sullivan - - - - -	11 -
18	Joseph Stanley.	—	25	Finocis M'Carthy - - -	14 -
19	William Bennish - - -	21 -	26	Thomas Howard - - - - -	14 -
20	Ditto - - - - -	—	27	Timothy Sullivan - - - -	10 -
21	James Stanley.	—	28	James Shine - - - - -	7 -
22	James Scott.	—	29	Denis Holland - - - - -	6 -
	Deal Yard-lane :		30	Joanna Murphy - - - - -	6 -
1	Michael Fitzgerald.	—	31	Jeremiah Shea.	—
2	James and H. Hamilton.	—	32	John Watson.	—
3	Timothy Donovan.	—	33	William Kelly.	—
4	Michael Oldham.	—	34	Timothy Downey.	—
5	Matthew Falvey.	—	35	Jeremiah Sullivan.	—
6	John Gabriel.	—	36	Edward De Courcy - - -	5 -
7	Ditto.	—	37	Jeremiah Coughlan - - -	10 -
8	Daniel Fitzpatrick.	—	38	Daniel Rees - - - - -	6 -
9	Thomas Barry.	—	39	Dora Beazly - - - - -	6 -
10	Ditto.	—	40	John Butler - - - - -	5 -
	Warner's-lane :		41	Anne Dealy.	—
1	James Fitzpatrick.	—	42	John Lantlam.	—
2	Mary Cronin.	—	43	Samuel Bally and Dora Sexton.	—
3	Henry Hussey.	—	44	Thomas Parrott.	—
4	Catherine Falvey.	—	45	John Fitzgerald.	—
4½	George Dowden.	—	46	James Healy.	—
5	Ditto.	—	47	Daniel Leary.	—
5½	Ditto.	—	48	Coracbus Crowley.	—
6	Thomas Carbery.	5 -	49	Patrick Mahony.	—
7	Joseph Hawkes.	—	50	John Sullivan.	—
8	—	—	51	James Conniffe - - - -	10 -
9	Stephen Sullivan - - -	8 -	52	James Holt - - - - -	5 -
10	Samuel Allman.	—	53	Richard Knight	5 -
11	Thomas Harrington.	—	54	Richard Fitzgerald.	—
12	John Samsary - - -	5 -	55	James Fielding.	—
13	Jeremiah Sullivan - - -	7 -	56	Jeremiah Donovan.	—
			57	Timothy Farrell.	—
			58	Jeremiah Leary.	—

Number of each House.	Name of Street and of each Occupier.	Estimated Annual Value.	Number of each House.	Name of Street and of each Occupier.	Estimated Annual Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
	Shannon-street—contd.	£. s.		Boyle-street—continued.	£. s.	
59	Patrick Collins - - -	9 - -	39	John Bere - - -	8 - -	
60	Daniel Dawly - - -	7 - -	40	Timothy Leary.	—	
61	Jeremiah M'Carthy - -	6 - -	41	Thomas Coughlan.	—	
62	Daniel Callaghan - - -	10 - -	42	John Neil.	—	
63	Samuel Burchill - - -	14 - -	43	Stephen Molony.	—	
64	Daniel Sullivan - - -	8 - -	44	Daniel Murphy.	—	
65	Samuel Birchill - - -	8 - -	45	Samuel Connell.	—	
66	Florence Crowley - - -	10 - -	46	—	—	
67	- - - - -	10 - -	47	Henry Searles.	—	
68	- - - - -	5 - -	48	Peter Burchill.	—	
69	Daniel Murphy - - -	8 - -	49	Philip Griffin.	—	
70	Elizabeth Kenney - - -	8 - -	50	John Wilmot.	—	
71	James Donovan - - -	10 - -	51	Denis Leary.	—	
72	Thomas Williams - - -	9 - -	52	—	—	
73	David White - - -	14 - -	53	Robert Maynard.	—	
74	John Browne - - -	12 - -	54	Owen Keefe.	—	
75	Launcelet Bright - - -	9 - -	55	Denis Desmond.	—	
76	Joanna Sullivan - - -	9 - -	56	John Searles.	—	
77	John Wade - - -	16 - -	57	George Kew.	—	
78	Edward Harrison - - -	14 - -	58	Moses Wilmot.	—	
79	Catherine Hezale - - -	14 - -	59	William Lake.	—	
80	William Browne - - -	12 - -	60	Michael Murphy.	—	
81	William Barry - - -	16 - -	61	Michael Sheehan.	—	
82	John Moore - - -	10 - -	62	Denis M'Carthy.	—	
83	Daniel Hurley - - -	25 - -	63	Daniel M'Carthy.	—	
84	Anne Cattan - - -	30 - -	64	Timothy Crowley.	—	
85	Michael Galway.	—	65	John Leeth.	—	
	Boyle-street :		66	Michael Randles.	—	
1	Michael Murphy - - -	8 - -	67	Batholomew Crowley.	—	
2	Joshua Keymes.	—	68	Catherine Smith.	—	
3	Thomas Mason.	—	69	Thomas Smith.	—	
4	Andrew Bandy.	—	70	Charles Hewitt.	—	
5	Patrick Dillon.	—	71	John M'Court.	—	
6	George Bennett.	—	72	Elizabeth Hitchcock.	—	
7	Robert Donovan - - -	5 - -	73	John Conner.	—	
8	Lt. John Abbott.	—	74	John Burchill.	—	
9	—	—	75	Jeremiah Mahony.	—	
10	John Hagarty.	—	76	George Morris.	—	
11	William Garvin.	—	77	Michael Olive & William Bevil.	—	
12	Mary Donovan.	—	78	Jeremiah Conner.	—	
13	Thomas Kelly.	—	79	Charles Skuse.	—	
14	Michael Tierney.	—	80	John Wright - - -	8 - -	
15	John Thomas.	—	81	George Bere - - -	5 - -	
16	Cornelius Colman.	—		Nursery-lane :		
17	Charles Hewitt - - -	8 - -	1	John Wade.	—	
18	Margaret Holmes - - -	8 - -	2	Ditto.	—	
19	Mary Mills - - -	6 - -	3	John Leslie.	—	
20	William Sullivan.	—	4	Ditto.	—	
21	Stephen Ryan.	—	5	John Wade.	—	
22	Eliza Shortes - - -	15 - -	6	Edward Harrison.	—	
23	John Connell.	—	7	Meeting-house.	—	
24	- - - - -	6 - -	8	William Norwood.	—	
25	Thomas Giles.	—		Factory-lane :		
26	William Busted.	—	1	John W. Sullivan.	—	
27	William Conner.	—	2	Ditto.	—	
28	Michael Murphy.	—	3	John Burchill.	—	
29	Timothy Harrington.	—	4	Thomas M. Sloane.	—	
30	Eugene O'Callaghan.	—	5	William Glasson.	—	
31	Daniel Ferde.	—	6	Thomas Bennett.	—	
32	—	—	7	Ditto.	—	
33	—	—	8	James Scott.	—	
34	Michael Callaghan.	—	9	John Richardson.	—	
35	James Thomas.	—	10	Ditto.	—	
36	Thomas Driscoll.	—				
37	Thomas O'Reilly.	—				
38	Thomas Cummins.	—				

(continued)

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

Number of each House.	Name of Street and of each Occupant.	Estimated Annual Value.	Number of each House.	Name of Street and of each Occupant.	Estimated Annual Value.
	Kingston-buildings :	£ s.		Hamilton's-lane—court.	£ s.
1	- - - - -	28 -	8	James Scott.	—
2	John O'Conner - - -	28 -	9	Rev. Armiger Sealy.	—
3	W. P. Watkins - - -	28 -	10	Charlotte Flyn.	—
4	Thomas Sherlock - - -	28 -	11	John Giles.	—
5	W. P. Watkins - - -	12 -	12	William Grimley.	—
6	Heater Waring - - -	20 -		Fuller's-lane :	
7	Elizabeth Baldwin - - -	16 -	1	Thomas Fuller.	—
	Hamilton's-lane :		2	Ditto.	—
1	William Richardson.	—	3	Ditto.	—
2	Rev. Armiger Sealy.	—	4	Ditto.	—
3	John Collins.	—	5	Daniel Carroll.	—
4	Rev. Armiger Sealy.	—	6	George Roche.	—
5	John Donovan.	—	7	John Woods.	—
6	John Giles.	—	8	Michael Mahony.	—
7	John Murnane.	—	9	Daniel Carol.	—

I certify that the foregoing is a true copy.

Note.—The several houses and premises for which no sum is stated or marked as the valuation are for the greater part under the value of 5 £, and others are adjoining to other premises, and valued therewith.

Edward Doherty, Town-clerk.

COLERAINE.

No.	NAMES.	Value.	No.	NAMES.	Value.
	Bridge-street :	£ s.		Quay :	£ s.
1	James Mathews - - -	20 -	1	John Given & Co., yard -	15 -
2	James Clarke - - -	18 -	2	Custom-house - - -	20 -
3	Thomas Gaw - - -	18 -		Barnack-yard :	
4	Thomas Clarke - - -	21 -	1	John M'Cormick - - -	not subject.
5	Patrick M'Henry - - -	21 -	2	John Lawrence - - -	not subject.
6	John Adams - - -	16 -	3	William Galsagh - - -	not subject.
7	Archibald M'Ilwain - - -	62 -	4	Moses M'Gaughey - - -	5 -
8	Archibald M'Ilwain - - -	62 -	5	Ditto - - -	7 -
9	Surgeon Lane - - -	28 -	6	Grogan & Stewart, stables	15 -
10	Felix O'Neil - - -	14 10	7	Patrick Doherty - - -	5 -
11	Miss Moore - - -	14 10		Diamond :	
12	M'Gonegal & O'Doherty	26 10	1	John M'Grotty - - -	55 -
13	Daniel Borr - - -	12 -	2	Rody M'Chisky - - -	15 -
14	Miss M'Menamy - - -	5 10	3	John Cockran - - -	22 -
15	Alexander Caldwell - - -	24 -	4	Anne M'Finlay - - -	27 10
16	Honourable Irish Society } Samuel and Thos. Smith }	65 -	5	James Gilmour - - -	22 10
17	Robert Weir - - -	20 -	6	James Caldwell - - -	52 -
18	Charles Daily - - -	20 -	7	James Caldwell - - -	25 -
19	John M'Farland - - -	25 -	8	Robert M'Coy - - -	24 -
20	Joseph Orr - - -	40 -	9	Samuel Hart - - -	20 -
21	John Dillon - - -	12 -	10	Miss Gals - - -	26 -
22	Sarah Mooney - - -	30 -	11	Miss Galt, post-office - - -	65 -
23	Robert Houston - - -	28 -	12	Misses Congrave - - -	24 -
24	Hon. A. Stewart, stable -	5 -	13	James M'Farland - - -	25 -
25	Misses Downey & M'Kenzie	16 -	13½	Ditto - - -	24 -
	Robert Kennedy - - -	9 -	14	Waste - - -	17 -
	Rice's-court :		15	Charles Montgomery - - -	30 -
1	Stores - - -	13 -	16	William Glen - - -	—

No.	NAMES.	Value.	No.	NAMES.	Value.	Appendix (G.)
	<i>Diamond—continued.</i>	£. s.		<i>New-row—continued.</i>	£. s.	Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
17	Joseph Orr - - -	23 -	5	Joseph M'Carter - - -	20 -	
18	Andrew Paul - - -	18 -	6	Miss Lawrence - - -	25 -	
19	Henry O'Connell - - -	18 -	7	John M'Lane - - -	10 -	
19½	Richard Burrell - - -	25 -	8	} Miss Lynn - - -	28 -	
20	Daniel Given - - -	30 -	8½			
21	William Wark - - -	31 10 -	9	John Stewart - - -	32 -	
22	William Young - - -	33 -	10	Miss Robinson - - -	30 -	
23	John Boyd - - -	20 -	11	Alexander Mitchell - - -	20 -	
24	Mrs. M'Kee - - -	23 -	12	O'Kane & Mitchell, brewery - - -	35 -	
25	John M'Kee - - -	28 -	13	Miss Gage - - -	28 -	
26	David Dunlop - - -	28 -	14	Doctor Neil, junior - - -	30 -	
27	Robert Turbet - - -	50 -	15	Samuel Knox & Son - - -	42 -	
28	Charles Knox - - -	10 -	16	} Robert M'Naghten - - -	30 -	
29	Waste - - -	18 -	17			
30	Benjamin Given - - -	50 -	18	Alexander Mitchell, store - - -	5 -	
31	} Widow M'Killep - - -	28 -	19	Andrew Ward - - -	18 -	
30½			20	Doctor Reid - - -	12 -	
33	James Galloway - - -	18 -	21	Mrs. M'Kerriek - - -	12 -	
34	Robert Kirkwood - - -	12 -	22	Miss Stewart - - -	23 -	
			23	Mrs. Dunlop - - -	23 -	
	<i>Church-street:</i>		24	Rev. John Whiteside - - -	23 -	
1	John Paul - - -	16 -	25	William Medlam - - -	11 -	
2	Thomas Barleigh - - -	18 -	26	Richard Horley - - -	12 -	
3	Abraham Felton - - -	17 -	27	John Hall - - -	12 -	
4	John Hamilton - - -	29 -	28	Robert Magee - - -	11 -	
5	James Walker - - -	20 -	29	James Lynch - - -	14 -	
6	George L. Carson - - -	25 -	30	Samuel Lawrence & Co. - - -	35 -	
7	William Donaldson - - -	38 -	31	Alexander Neil - - -	20 -	
8	Joseph Caskey - - -	18 -				
8½	Thomas Lusk - - -	18 -		<i>Stone-row:</i>		
9	John Knox - - -	14 -	6	James Galloway, stable - - -	7 10 -	
10	Anne Robb - - -	25 -	7	James Anderson - - -	5 -	
11	Robert Acheson - - -	15 -	8	Jr M'Grotty, yard & stable - - -	16 -	
12	John M'Donald - - -	16 -	3	William Hertford - - -	12 -	
13	Robert Thompson - - -	30 -	4	Peter Dempsey - - -	8 -	
14	John Geary - - -	30 -	10	James M'Grotty - - -	5 -	
15	Encus M'Alister - - -	33 -	13	Messrs. O'Connell, timber-yard - - -	10 -	
16	M'Williams & Hill - - -	20 -	14	W ^m Wiley Lawrence, store - - -	12 -	
17	Robert Lithgow - - -	9 -	16	James Greaves - - -	5 -	
18	Hugh Kane - - -	7 -	17			
19	Samuel Brown - - -	20 -	21			
20	John Boyland (widower) - - -	40 -		<i>Messing-house-lease:</i>		
20½	Ditto - - -	40 -	1	John Doherty - - -	25 -	
21	Daniel Taylor - - -	25 -	-	Mr. Green's office - - -	6 10 -	
22	Hector M'Caughan - - -	15 -	2	Harman Cochran - - -	13 -	
23	David Patton - - -	13 -	3	Mrs. Murray - - -	5 -	
24	William Anderson - - -	32 -	4	James Keith - - -	10 -	
25	Robert Nevin - - -	12 10 -	5	Robert Paul - - -	15 -	
26	Samuel Caskey - - -	18 -	6	Ditto - - -	5 -	
27	Robert Hourton - - -	30 -	6	John May - - -	12 -	
28	Thomas M'Mullen - - -	20 -	9	John Dunca - - -	12 -	
29	John Church - - -	5 -	10	Daniel Christie - - -	18 -	
30	Robert Given - - -	30 -	11	Henry Richardson - - -	13 -	
31	Hugh Bellas - - -	40 -	12	Mrs. Cosment - - -	13 -	
32	Joseph Wainock - - -	19 -	13	Mrs. Harill - - -	18 -	
33	Robert Allison - - -	45 -	14	David M'Gonegal - - -	13 -	
34	John Given & Co. - - -	50 -	15	Mrs. Gathrie - - -	13 -	
35	John B. M'Grotty - - -	30 -	16	R. Sharpe - - -	22 -	
36	Waste - - -	18 -	17	Stephen Blaney - - -	5 -	
37	Thomas Liken - - -	16 -	18	Mrs. Malcolm - - -	5 -	
38	Mrs. Lynn - - -	8 -	19	John Confield - - -	16 -	
39	Mrs. Lynn - - -	18 -	20			
40	John M'Curdy - - -	18 -	21	Stores, and timber-yard - - -	10 -	
			22			
	<i>New-row:</i>		23			
1	James Aicott - - -	6 -	24	John Taggart - - -	20 -	
2	William M'Gowan - - -	18 -	25	Michael Doherty - - -	7 -	
3	John Campbell - - -	10 -	26	John M'Quillen - - -	8 -	
4	James Barr - - -	30 -	27	Michael Doherty, off. - - -	-	

(continued)

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Town
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	NAMES.	Value.	No.	NAMES.	Value.
	Meeting-house-lane—contd.	£. s.		Stable-lane—continued.	£. s.
28	Mary Doherty, off.	—	9	John Bently - - -	5 -
29	Miss Rice - - -	30 -	10	John Kane - - -	5 -
30	George M'Laughlin - -	12 -	11	Wiley Lawrence, store	8 -
30½	John O'Hara - - -	8 -		Upper Stone-row:	
31	Waste - - -	10 -		Richard Yates - - -	10 -
	Waste - - -	—	6	Neal O'Hale - - -	10 -
33	Waste - - -	10 -	7	Mrs. M'Farland - - -	16 -
34	Waste - - -	6 -	8	James Cowan - - -	16 -
35	Waste - - -	10 -	9	John P. Taggard, waste	10 -
36	Edward Lee - - -	30 -	10	W ^m Jackson (& Co) joint-oc-	
37	Thomas Andrews - - -	11 -	11	Nath ^l Adams - cupants.	10 -
	Hanover-place:		12	Miss Thompson - - -	28 -
1	John Robinson { separate		13	Doctor Graham - - -	14 -
	Con Doherty - { tenements	22 -	14	Waste - - -	19 -
				Meeting-house-place:	
2	Harriet Dunlop, custom-	25 -	15½	Mrs. Holmes - - -	30 -
	house.		16½	David M'Nab - - -	5 -
3	Ditto, store - - -	30 -	6	Mrs. Gregory - - -	25 -
4	Alexander Healey - - -	18 -	7	Jonathan Nicholson - -	22 -
5	John Dunlop - - -	18 -	8	Charles Doherty - - -	6 10
6	Thomas Black - - -	22 -	9	Edward Begby - - -	6 10
7	Samuel Lawrence - - -	60 -		Preaching-house-lane:	
8	Provincial bank - - -	55 -	1	Mrs. Jackson - - -	6 10
9	Rev. Mr. Cuff - - -	27 -	2	Warren Baxter - - -	10 -
10	Waste - - -	26 -	3	Miss Merrows - - -	6 -
11	Richard M'Laughlin.	—	5	Joseph Caskey, store	5 -
14	Waste - - -	5 -	6	Mr. Mitchell, store	5 -
15	Richard M'Laughlin	13 -	6	Ditto - - ditto - - -	7 -
16	Charles Foster - - -	5 -	7	Ditto - - ditto - - -	18 -
17	Waste - - -	17 -	8	Preaching-house - - -	10 -
18	Miss Quigley - - -	17 -	8½	W ^m Bradley, not subject.	—
	Ferry Quay-street:		9½	Thomas Armstrong	10 -
2	Francis M'Ilwain - - -	20 -	10	Doctor Boyd - - -	12 -
	Mrs. Higgins - - -	6 -		Bellhouse-lane:	
	John Burdot - - -	6 -	23	John Gough - - -	5 -
6	Daniel Smith - - -	6 -	24	Waste - - -	10 -
7	Mrs. Leslie - - -	6 -	25	Benjamin Given - - -	25 -
10	A. M'Ilwain, garden	5 -		Rosemary-lane:	
	A. Lamont - - -	6 -	1	Dispensary - - -	10 -
21	Robert M'Intire - - -	6 -	2	David Beverland - - -	14 -
22	Miss Hurley - - -	6 -	20	O'Kane & Mitchell - - -	18 -
	Cross-lane:			Society-street:	
	Miss Craig - - -	5 -	1	Samuel Miligan - - -	8 -
1	Francis Hurley - - -	5 -	2	James Canning - - -	8 -
2	Thomas Boyle - - -	14 -	3	Miss Eaken - - -	5 10
3	Mrs. Gratten - - -	10 -	3	Mrs. Thompson - - -	6 -
4	Charles Boyd - - -	10 -	4	John M'Pherson - - -	6 -
5	William Bond - - -	5 -	5	Thomas O'Hale - - -	10 -
6	Hugh M'Mahon - - -	10 -	6	Adam M'Kay - - -	19 -
7	Mr. Mitchell's store	9 -	7	Widow Boylan, store	5 -
7½	Mrs. M'Grotty - - -	5 -	8	Rampart:	
8	James M'Jenkins - - -	7 -		William Templeton - - -	8 -
9	Waste - - -	8 -		New Market:	
10	Robert Johnson - - -	8 -	1	Excise-office - - -	20 -
11	Police barrack - - -	17 -	2	Robert Gaston - - -	14 10
12	Mathew Harshaw - - -	8 -	3	James Craig - - -	20 -
13	John Ingman - - -	7 -	4	Thomas Black, distillery	50 -
14	James May - - -	8 -	5	New-market - - -	150 -
	Stable-lane:		6	Miss Laken - - -	12 -
1	J. C. Berresford, school.	—	7	William Simpson - - -	14 -
4	J. Cochran, store - - -	10 -			
5	J. Taggard, loft - - -	6 -			
6	John Spenser, store	12 -			
7	Waste - - -	5 -			
8	Jane M'Peak - - -	5 -			

No.	NAMES.	Value.	No.	NAMES.	Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members of Par- liament.
	Upper New-row :	£. s.		North Brook-street :	£. s.	
1	Joseph Miller - - -	10 -	1	James Taylor - - -	6 -	
13	Thomas Boyd - - -	5 -	2	— - - - -	—	
13½	John Doman - - -	5 -	—	James Dinmore - - -	10 -	
14	Mrs. Fife - - - - -	5 -	14	James Gibben - - -	5 -	
15	Gabriel McElevey - -	7 10 -	—	Andrew Brewster - -	7 -	
15½	Sergt. Mathews - - -	5 -	35	James Fulleston - - -	5 -	
15½	Mrs. McKown - - - -	5 -	41	Mrs. Patterson - - -	10 -	
16	William Campbell - -	6 -	42	Patrick Gannon - - -	5 -	
18	Mrs. Church - - - - -	6 -	43	Not subject.	—	
19	Sergt. Elliott - - - -	6 -	43	James Patterson - - -	6 10 -	
—	Miss Hyndman - - - -	8 -	51	Widow Mains - - - -	6 -	
			53	John McAfee - - - -	5 -	
			60	Mill, Mr. Renie's - - -	50 -	
	Headgate-street :			North Brook-place :		
1	Mr. Dunlop - - - - -	12 -		Mr. McCurdy - - - -	10 -	
2	Miss Young - - - - -	8 -	6	Frank Valls - - - - -	5 -	
3	Mrs. Paul - - - - -	8 -	7			
4	Waste - - - - -	8 -		Church's-wall :		
5	Mrs. Andrews - - - -	9 -	1	John McCurdy, tan-yard -	19 -	
6	Miss Steen - - - - -	9 -				
12	John Steels - - - - -	7 10 -		Highland-row :		
13	James Quigley - - - -	8 -	1	Miss Dallas - - - - -	35 -	
14	Mrs. Moore - - - - -	6 -	14	John Todd - - - - -	9 -	
—	Mrs. Barnside (Bannfield- lane).	6 -	15	Mr. Hastings - - - -	11 -	
			16	Henry Dallas - - - -	7 10 -	
	Borrisfield-place :			Mill-street :		
1	John Cassing - - - - -	20 -		Kila - - - - -	5 -	
2	J. C. Borrisford - - -	40 -	8	John Church - - - - -	5 -	
3	Miss Rippingham - - -	12 -	9	John McCappin - - - -	5 -	
			10			
	Terrace-row :		11			
—	Hugh Bellas, yard - - -	25 -		Long Commons :		
1	Mr. Burke - - - - -	7 -	1	Waste - - - - -	5 -	
2	Waste - - - - -	6 -	—	William Edger - - - -	5 -	
3	Mr. Wallace - - - - -	8 -	—	Samuel Hemphill - - -	7 -	
4	Waste - - - - -	7 -	—	Robert Boyd - - - - -	5 -	
8	Isaac Meenan - - - - -	5 -	—	Dan. Templeton - - - -	5 -	
			—	Robert Edmiston - - - -	5 -	
	Kingsgate-street :		53	James Gilmore, barn - -	5 -	
1	Henry Patterson - - -	10 -	53	John Coyle - - - - -	7 -	
1½	William Groves - - - -	10 -	79	Chas. Jas. Knox's tenants, unoccupied.	22 -	
2	Robert Shups - - - - -	20 -	80	Jas. Moore, yard and store	12 -	
3	Samuel Boyce - - - - -	10 -				
4	John Wilson - - - - -	10 -		Waterside :		
5	Unoccupied - - - - -	8 -	1	Thomas Davock - - - -	50 -	
6	J. & W. Glen and John McCloy, joint occupants.	15 -	2	Thomas Hughs - - - - -	8 -	
8	Adam Mathers - - - - -	6 -	3	John McCracken - - - -	12 -	
9	Unoccupied - - - - -	12 10 -	4	Miss O'Kane - - - - -	36 -	
10	Alexander Culbert - - -	24 -	5	Thomas Dwylop - - - -	27 -	
11	Michael Doherty - - - -	25 -	6	Michael Bradley - - - -	10 -	
12	Stewart Norris - - - -	17 -	7	Robert Campbell - - - -	9 -	
13	Waste - - - - -	17 -	8	Denis Bradley - - - - -	25 -	
14	John McGowan - - - - -	17 -	9	Neal Curry - - - - -	7 10 -	
15	Hugh McAfee - - - - -	23 -	10	William Hall - - - - -	10 -	
			11	Robert & J. Calderwood -	23 -	
	Brook-street :		12	Miss Rogers - - - - -	10 -	
7	Thomas Anderson - - - -	7 -	13	Wilson Orr - - - - -	20 -	
8	Daniel Edmiston - - - -	5 -	14	Edward Gibben - - - -	25 -	
11	Charles Carristan - - -	5 -	15	John Paul - - - - -	23 -	
16	Thomas Coan - - - - -	25 -	16	James Paul - - - - -	18 -	
23	James Ewing - - - - -	5 -	17	Eliza Caldwell - - - -	12 -	
25	Edward F. Saurin - - -	12 -		Captain-street :		
26	Mrs. Gribben - - - - -	6 10 -	1	Henry McDonough - - -	28 -	
27	Mrs. Gribben - - - - -	6 -	2	John Laurimore - - - -	6 -	
28	Frank Doherty - - - - -	5 -	3	James Bonartou - - - -	5 -	
29	William Grey - - - - -	8 -	2			

(continued)

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	NAMES.	Value.	No.	NAMES.	Value.
	Captain-street—contd.	£. s.		Killowen-street:	£. s.
4	Sarah Dorman - - -	7 -	1	Thomas Dunlop, store -	5 -
7	Peter Laferty - - -	18 -	2	Thomas Scholtes - - -	18 -
8	James Monogal - - -	5 -	4	John Glen - - -	8 10
10	John McInzie - - -	7 10	586	Mrs. McGowan - - -	9 10
12	Thomas Miller - - -	8 -	9	Simon Coates - - -	6 -
17	Ernest Lynch - - -	8 -	13	Mrs. Peat - - -	7 -
18	James Caldwell - - -	5 -	14	Hector McLean - - -	5 -
20	Sergt. Broilley - - -	20 -	16	James Farrell - - -	8 10
27	James Gribben - - -	5 -	-	John Mitchell - - -	7 10
28	Archibald Gribben - - -	12 10	-	James Boyle - - -	7 10
33	Stephen Condon - - -	26 -	61	Thomas Dunlop - - -	6 -
34	Daniel Kerr - - -	6 -	86	James Gage - - -	6 -
46	John McKillip - - -	5 -	87	Charles Morrison - - -	5 -
48	Patrick Cameron - - -	6 -	90	George Doherty - - -	10 10
65	George McLaughlin - - -	6 -	91	Matthew Geze - - -	6 10
65	William Miller - - -	7 -	94	Richard Hughes - - -	7 -
54	William Anderson - - -	6 -	97	Robert McHarg - - -	6 -
70	James McKittrick - - -	12 -	98	Mark Hasket - - -	5 -
71	Mrs. Weir - - -	6 -	100	Laughlin Cameron - - -	5 -
113	Samuel Miller - - -	6 -	103	Samuel Sherrard - - -	17 -
114	David Miller - - -	6 -	104	Robert Eaton - - -	10 -
115	Rev. Daniel O'Doherty - - -	12 -			
116	John Kitley - - -	5 -		Jackson-hall:	
117	Robert Macrow - - -	7 10		Mrs. Warring Maxwell,	100 -
118	John McMagh - - -	7 10		(castle.)	
121	Gab. Cunningham - - -	6 -		Castle-lane:	
122	James Griffith - - -	9 -	6	Stephen Condon, store -	7 -
125	James McCurdy - - -	6 10	7	James Gribben - - -	6 -
128	John Loughry - - -	9 -		Taylor's row:	
129	William Mitchell - - -	8 -	1	Samuel King - - -	8 -
132	Pat. Dempsey - - -	6 -	2	Joseph Ferguson - - -	7 -
133	Mr. Caldwell - - -	22 -	3	William Mc Cormick - - -	6 -
134	John Caldwell - - -	20 -			
134	Edward Cumble - - -	6 -			
135	William Thomas - - -	5 -			
136	Stephen Condon - - -	23 -			

The annexed valuation sworn before me, this 5th day of September 1834,
(signed) Samuel Lawrence,
Chairman of Commissioners.

Archibald McEwan, James Caldwell, William Holmes, Valuers.

Number of tenements valued	-	-	-	-	434
Viz: At 5 l. and not amounting to 10 l.	-	-	-	-	172
At 10 l. and not amounting to 20 l.	-	-	-	-	135
At 20 l. and upwards	-	-	-	-	127
TOTAL	-	-	-	-	434

I certify that the foregoing is a correct copy of the valuation made in the borough of Coleraine, by the Commissioners, in the year 1834, under the authority and as directed by the Act 9 Geo. 4, intitled, "An Act to make provision for the Lighting, Watching and Cleansing of Cities, Towns Corporate and Market Towns, in Ireland, in certain cases."

Coleraine, 27 March 1837.
Denis Bradley,
Clerk to the Commissioners.

I do not consider that these returns are any criterion to judge of the qualification of persons who are registered as householders in this borough, as the Parliamentary borough extends to a larger circumference than that portion which is under the operation of the Lighting and Watching Act, and that, therefore, many persons appear as registered voters for this borough whose names do not appear, several of them holding town-parks in connexion with houses of small value, out of which joint qualification they are registered, and many occupying farms in the Parliamentary borough, altogether from under the operation of this Act.

Samuel Lawrence,
Chairman of Commissioners for Lighting, &c.

Appendix (G.)

Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Name of Street and Occupant's Name.	Annual Value.	No.	Name of Street and Occupant's Name.	Annual Value.
	Perry-street—cont^d.	£. s.		Scotch-street—cont^d.	£. s.
39	Thomas Ennes - - -	7 -	36	Michael O'Neal - - -	10 -
40	Benjamin M'Caulyly - - -	7 -	36	Robert Irwin - - -	9 -
41	John Hughes - - -	9 -	37	James Wilson - - -	15 -
42	Arthur Maguire - - -	9 -	38	Robert Moore - - -	24 -
43	Daniel Kilpatrick - - -	9 -	39	David Dooley - - -	7 -
44	Robert Newburn - - -	9 -	40	Robert Mallan - - -	15 -
45	Mr. Mackey - - -	9 -	41	Richard Simmons - - -	25 -
46	Thomas Greaves - - -	40 -	42	Miss Rodgers - - -	34 -
47	Mr. Maxwell - - -	9 -	43	Thomas M'Adam - - -	20 -
48	Dr. Hamilton - - -	7 -	44	Alexander Anderson - - -	25 -
49	Mr. Bell - - -	7 -	45	Owen M'Shane - - -	27 -
-	Earl Ranfury - - -	300 -	46	James Mullan - - -	32 -
-	Edward Evans, esq. - - -	100 -	47	James Dickson - - -	28 -
			48	James Knox - - -	15 -
	Northland-row :		49	Joseph Burns - - -	12 -
1	Miss Small - - -	10 -	50	Robert Glass - - -	14 -
2	Mrs. Barclay - - -	15 -	51	John Matthias - - -	18 -
3	Maxwell M'Avoy - - -	14 -	52	Dr. Bolton - - -	35 -
4	Mr. De Acosta - - -	10 -	53	Alexander Frizell - - -	30 -
5	Julip Geraghty, esq. - - -	35 -	54	Patt Quin - - -	5 -
6	Mrs. Brown - - -	35 -	55	Mr. Gibson - - -	5 -
7	Robert Smith, esq. - - -	35 -	56	Robert Meenagh - - -	10 -
8	Andrew Newton - - -	45 -	57	David Hughes - - -	5 -
9	Miss Greaves - - -	45 -	58	William Ferguson - - -	5 -
10	John Suster, esq. - - -	45 -	59	David Hughes - - -	5 -
11	George E. Stuart, esq. - - -	30 -	60	Richard Frizell - - -	16 -
12	Mr. Pole - - -	30 -	61	Alexander Frizell - - -	18 -
-	Rev. Mr. Darby - - -	150 -	64	Ferncis M'Kenzie - - -	9 -
			65	Samuel Brown - - -	20 -
	Ranfury-terrace :		66	Terence Muigrew - - -	13 -
1	Rev. Dr. Montague - - -	30 -	67	William Rodgers - - -	15 -
2	Miss Galbreath - - -	30 -	68	John M'Gayhin - - -	8 -
6	Mr. Wright - - -	5 -	69	William Thompson - - -	10 -
-	National school - - -	5 -	70	William Sloan - - -	12 -
			71	Roddy Doyle - - -	6 -
	Scotch-street :		72	Arthur Bolan - - -	5 -
1	Thomas Lilburn - - -	36 -	73	John M'Corrick - - -	6 -
2	Dr. Dawson - - -	15 -	74	William Mooney - - -	8 -
3	Miss Handcock - - -	20 -	76	Mr. O'Farrell - - -	11 -
4	Richard Doak - - -	10 -	76	Neal M'Court - - -	14 -
5	William Burns - - -	11 -	77	Alexander Mackenzie - - -	25 -
6	Robert Lucas - - -	8 -	-	John Sencson - - -	20 -
7	Robert Copeland - - -	8 -			
8	Widow Frizell - - -	5 -		Irish-street :	
9	Edward Griffith - - -	11 -	1	Patrick Fullan - - -	28 -
10	John Bently - - -	18 -	2	John Hughes - - -	10 -
11	William Bell - - -	10 -	3	Henry Hughes - - -	9 -
12	Robert Meenagh - - -	16 -	4	Joseph Irwin - - -	25 -
13	Maxwell M'Avoy - - -	9 -	5	Edward Wier - - -	11 -
14	William Morrison - - -	18 -	6	John M'Clelland - - -	20 -
15	William Moore - - -	7 -	7	William Wilson - - -	10 -
16	Thomas Brown - - -	6 -	8	William Dooley - - -	7 -
17	Newroom - - -	12 -	9	Biddy Hughes - - -	7 -
18	William Peebles, esq. - - -	12 -	10		
19	Wesley Trotter - - -	30 -	11	Patt Hewburn - - -	7 -
20	William Douglas - - -	19 -	12	Dr. M'Clean - - -	8 -
21	Joseph Thompson - - -	18 -	13	Michael Hewburn - - -	7 -
22	John Gorman - - -	16 -	14	John Muldoon - - -	8 -
23	Miss Brannon - - -	16 -	15	Edward M'Peck - - -	8 -
24	Alexander Kennedy - - -	16 -	16	George Hanyngton - - -	9 -
25	New shambles - - -	10 -	17	Patt Morrison - - -	6 -
26	Miss Fox - - -	10 -	18	Mrs. Mallan - - -	5 -
27	Dr. Cussidy - - -	14 -	19	John Smith - - -	5 -
28	Wood C. Hazleton - - -	25 -	20	Denny M'Shane - - -	6 -
29	Mr. O'Farrell - - -	12 -	21	John Smith - - -	5 -
30	Richard D. Henther - - -	12 -	22	Mr. Murphy - - -	11 -
31	John Mullan - - -	22 -	24		

No.	Name of Street and Occupant's Name.	Annual Value.	No.	Name of Street and Occupant's Name.	Annual Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
	<i>Irish-street—continued.</i>	£. s.		<i>Ann-street—continued.</i>	£. s.	
25	Robert Gestons - - -	18 -	13	Thomas Libborn - - -	25 -	
26	Alex. McMillen - - -	22 -	15	Joseph Mc'Gaghey - - -	8 -	
27	James Clarke - - -	22 -	16	Robert Mc'Guffin - - -	7 -	
28	John Lowry - - -	5 -	18	Mrs. Moon - - -	20 -	
30	James Dalworth - - -	10 -		Pat Sharkey - - -	5 -	
31	Biddy Langhran - - -	5 -	22	John Mallan - - -	5 -	
32	Daniel McCreedy - - -	5 -	23	Robert Smith - - -	5 -	
36	Edward Mc'Girr - - -	25 -	24	William Martin - - -	5 -	
37	Mrs. Atwell - - -	8 -	25	Widow Halliday - - -	5 -	
38	Bernard Mooney - - -	18 -	26	John O'Donoghil - - -	5 -	
39	Robert Mc'Shane - - -	6 -	27	Owen Mc'Gladriggan - - -	5 -	
40	Bernard Mc'Shane - - -	6 -	28	Lawrence Kelly - - -	5 -	
41	Felix Mc'Elhone - - -	25 -	29	John Hughes - - -	5 -	
42	James Mc'Elhone - - -	17 -	30	James Donaghey - - -	5 -	
43	John Fullan - - -	17 -	31	Hugh Templeton - - -	7 -	
44	John Scaddington - - -	8 -	32	John Benven - - -	8 -	
45	Mary Mc'Donnell - - -	6 -	33	William Irwin - - -	18 -	
46	Pat Fox - - -	6 -	34	James Quin - - -	16 -	
47	Michael Dailey - - -	6 -	35	Richard Murray, esq. - - -	40 -	
48	Michael Rodgers - - -	5 -	36	John S. Manay - - -	15 -	
49	Mrs. Mee - - -	5 -	37	Police barracks - - -	90 -	
50	Hugh Donley - - -	6 -	38	Robert Stephenson - - -	26 -	
51	James Mc'Elhone - - -	7 -				
52	Terence Boyle - - -	14 -		<i>William-street:</i>		
53	John Haggan - - -	18 -	1	Mr. Godfrey - - -	10 -	
54	William Lister - - -	9 -	2	Mrs. Swan - - -	10 -	
55	Denis Haulon - - -	6 -	3	Dr. Harvey - - -	10 -	
56	John Brown - - -	15 -	4	James Mc'Mahon - - -	5 -	
57	James Walsh - - -	9 -	5	Mrs. Gestons - - -	5 -	
58	Owen Mc'Gargan - - -	9 -	6	Michael Mc'Gone - - -	5 -	
59	Michael Madden - - -	16 -	7	Mr. Nesbit - - -	15 -	
60	John Madden - - -	10 -	8	Old Market-house - - -	10 -	
61	John Finell - - -	9 -	9	Mr. Beatty - - -	20 -	
62	John Mc'Shane - - -	15 -				
63	Mathew Kelly - - -	18 -		<i>George's-street:</i>		
64	Owen Quin - - -	14 -	1	Alex. Glass - - -	10 -	
65	William Irwin - - -	14 -	2	Alex. White - - -	6 -	
66	Con O'Neal - - -	16 -	3	John Muldoon - - -	6 -	
67	Terence Bennigan - - -	35 -	4	Richard Dorse - - -	20 -	
68	William Campbell - - -	7 -	5	Mrs. Donaldson - - -	15 -	
69	Dr. Mc'Clean - - -	22 -	6	Mr. Cochran - - -	16 -	
70	Terence Bennigan - - -	20 -	7	John Mc'Kitack - - -	10 -	
-	Mr. Donaldson - - -	10 -	8	John Store - - -	5 -	
	<i>Barrick-street:</i>		9	Mr. Mayill - - -	5 -	
15	Peter Donley - - -	6 -	10	Thomas Libborn - - -	10 -	
20	William Morrison - - -	7 -	11	Ditto - - -	6 -	
	<i>Union-place:</i>		12	Alex. Mackenzie - - -	25 -	
6	Francis Harpur - - -	9 -	13	John C. Irwin - - -	14 -	
7	Mrs. Kinley - - -	15 -	14	Rev. Mr. Muldoon - - -	16 -	
11	Mr. O'Rourke - - -	15 -	15	Mr. Coeiner - - -	16 -	
12	James Wilson - - -	5 -	16	James Mallan - - -	11 -	
13	Mrs. Dickson - - -	33 -	17			
14	Major Flood - - -	17 -	18	<i>Shamble-lane:</i>		
15	Mr. Talton - - -	16 -	19	Rose Mc'Elkenny - - -	5 -	
16	Samuel Davidson - - -	33 -	20	Felix O'Hara - - -	5 -	
	<i>Ann-street:</i>		21	John Mallan - - -	5 -	
3	John Mc'Gaghey - - -	8 -	22	James Mallan - - -	5 -	
4	Thomas Henderson - - -	5 -	23	Pauick Mc'Shane - - -	5 -	
6	Mrs. Smith - - -	5 -	24	George Mc'Cann - - -	6 -	
7	Thomas Charleton - - -	5 -	25	James Gafney - - -	11 -	
8	James Hamilton - - -	5 -				
11	Mr. O'Neal - - -	22 -				

(continued)

Appendix (G.)
—
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Name of Street and Occupant's Name.	Annual Value.	No.	Name of Street and Occupant's Name.	Annual Value.
	Shamble-lane—continued.	£. s.		Mill-town :	£. s.
10	Fordy Morrison - - -	5 -	1	Mr. Trotter - - -	20 -
11	Pat Morrison - - -	5 -	14	Mr. Lyons - - -	5 -
13	Rich. Morrow - - -	5 -	21	James McKenna - - -	5 -
14	Stephen Keenan - - -	5 -	22	Mathew Kelly - - -	5 -
15	Mrs. Moon - - -	5 -	23	Mr. Heayne - - -	5 -
			24	Edward Muldoon - - -	5 -
	Sloun-street :		25	John Falls, esq. - - -	25 -
			43	Charles Mallan - - -	5 -
1	William O'Hara - - -	5 -	44	Mr. M'Bride - - -	10 -
2	John O'Neal - - -	5 -	48	Andrew Maguire - - -	9 -
			50	Bernard Hughes - - -	15 -

16 March 1837.

John Falls, Chairman.

Patrick Fallas, Clerk.

G A L W A Y.

A RETURN of the Names and Residences of the several PERSONS who have been discharged from Payment of Local Rates or Taxes by reason of their Tenements being of less Annual Value than 10*l.*, or for any other and what Reasons.

THERE have not been any persons discharged from payment of local rates or taxes by reason of their tenements being of less annual value than 10*l.*, or for any other reason, in the town of Galway.

The return of the several houses in the town of Galway appears by the Schedules herunto annexed, with the exception of the number of each house, which could not be returned, as the houses in the town of Galway are not numbered.

17 March 1837.

John M. O'Hara,

Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

Streets, Houses, and Names of Occupants.	Annual Value.	Streets, Houses, and Names of Occupants.	Annual Value.
Abbey Gate-street, west :	£.	Abbey Gate-st., west—cont ^d .	£.
Mrs. Marryn's house - - -	24	Mr. Blakney's house - - -	24
William Wyld's - - -	15	Michael M'Donnell's - - -	12
Henry Daggan's - - -	24	John Murphy's - - -	20
Timothy Murray's - - -	16	Richard Burke & Miss Bodkin's	24
Ditto - - - - -	24	Mrs. Burke's - - - - -	16
John Fahy's - - - - -	4	Pat Daggan's - - - - -	32
Mathew Brown's - - - -	8	Edward Cuffers's - - - -	22
William Wyld's - - - -	5		
Edward Good's - - - -	24	Abbey Gate-street, east :	
Edward Murphy's - - - -	8	James Joyce's - - - - -	24
Frank Kenny's - - - - -	16	Mrs. Finley's - - - - -	14
Peter Grealish's - - - -	10	Francis Kenny's - - - -	8
John Mitchell's - - - -	15	Nicholas Bati's - - - -	2
William Coleman's - - - -	40		
Nicholas P. Trenche's - -	—	Lombard-street, north side :	
Dr. Kenting's - - - - -	12	Nicholas Bodkin's - - - -	16
Society-room - - - - -	40	John Joyce's - - - - -	80
Patrick Burk's - - - - -	15	Mr. Walsh's - - - - -	20
Pat Burke's - - - - -	10	Widow Lynch's - - - - -	4
Nolan M'Donogh's - - - -	6	Nicholas Connell's - - - -	15
Mr. Sheridan's - - - - -	10	Constantine O'Hara's - - - -	26
John Halloran's - - - - -	24	Andrew Lovelock's - - - -	32
Thomas Corr's - - - - -	22	Walter Scamton's - - - -	40
John Kirwan's - - - - -	50	Widow Smyth's - - - - -	8
Timothy Murray's - - - -	40	Widow M'Cartney's - - - -	8
Pat Nolan's - - - - -	24	Edmond Leonard's - - - -	10
		Thomas Lally's - - - - -	10

Streets, Houses, and Names of Occupants.	Annual Value.	Streets, Houses, and Names of Occupants.	Annual Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
Lombard-street, south side :	£.	Shop-street, south side—contd.	£.	
William Taly's house - - -	12	Lawrence Costello's house - - -	8	
Michael Daly's - - - - -	6	Redmond Commia's - - - - -	40	
Mrs. Francis's - - - - -	20	Joseph Bath's - - - - -	24	
Mrs. Joyce's - - - - -	4	James Tynn's - - - - -	32	
Terence Sullivan's - - - -	10	Michael Horne's - - - - -	20	
Richard Burke's - - - - -	20	Patt Crain's - - - - -	16	
Thomas Leonard's - - - - -	12	James Kein's - - - - -	14	
Nicholas Burke's - - - - -	40	James Tynn's - - - - -	12	
		Michael Wubb's - - - - -	24	
Mainguard-street :		Richard Burke's - - - - -	24	
Mrs. Kenney's - - - - -	14	Patrick Commia's - - - - -	24	
Mrs. Coyne's - - - - -	24	Patt Quinn's - - - - -	14	
Thomas Lally's - - - - -	16	Miss Kearney's - - - - -	14	
Widow Mitchell's - - - - -	6			
Widow White's - - - - -	6	High-street, north :		
James O'Doherty's - - - - -	72	Mrs. O'Shaughnessy's - - - - -	20	
Patt Reed's - - - - -	16	Miss Dopson's - - - - -	14	
Patt Perrins's - - - - -	72	James O'Flaherty's - - - - -	40	
John Grenly's - - - - -	26	Ditto - - - - -	30	
John Neria's - - - - -	8	William Costello's - - - - -	32	
		Miss Cox's - - - - -	40	
Shop-street, north side :		William Coleman's - - - - -	40	
John Stephens's - - - - -	48	Dr. Bodkin's - - - - -	40	
Patrick Taly's - - - - -	6	Mathew Heasley's - - - - -	40	
Patt Burke's - - - - -	26			
Patt Murphy's - - - - -	24	High-street, south side :		
John Taly's - - - - -	16	Mr. O'Kelly's - - - - -	—	
Tudsy Malley's - - - - -	80	Mr. Keasley and Mr. Sbell's - - - -	24	
Marion Kinneavy's - - - - -	32	Dr. Mahon's - - - - -	16	
Ditto - - - - -	50	George Connelly's - - - - -	26	
John Coleman's - - - - -	30	Mathew Clayton's - - - - -	20	
James Gunning's - - - - -	14			
Darby Ward's - - - - -	18	High-street, north side :		
William Burke's - - - - -	110	Mr. Kync's - - - - -	40	
James Lynch's - - - - -	56	Anthony Lynch's - - - - -	40	
Richard Joyce's - - - - -	34	Mrs. Syncock's - - - - -	28	
Edward Murphy's - - - - -	12	Hugh Cassidy's - - - - -	16	
James Griffin's - - - - -	8	Mrs. Deas's - - - - -	28	
Francis Holland's - - - - -	8	Luke Croughan's - - - - -	8	
Mrs. Bermingham and Costello's - - -	40	Laurence Geoghegan's - - - - -	16	
Charles Cosarillo's - - - - -	48	Mr. Thomas O'Maley's - - - - -	10	
Austin Kelly's - - - - -	48	Richard Burke's - - - - -	60	
James Knight's - - - - -	30	Edward Coffey's - - - - -	64	
Mark Keady's - - - - -	40	Miss Staunton's - - - - -	8	
Stephen Pidgeon's - - - - -	18	Patt Perrins's - - - - -	16	
Peter Lynche's - - - - -	74	William Downey's - - - - -	16	
Peter Monk's - - - - -	30	James Duggan's - - - - -	16	
Dr. Egan's - - - - -	64	Mrs. Syncock's - - - - -	20	
Dr. Martyn's - - - - -	40			
Daniel Considine's - - - - -	14	Middle-street, north side :		
John Morriay's - - - - -	16	Miss Coppinger's - - - - -	16	
Mathew Bodkin's - - - - -	14	Mr. James Browne's - - - - -	24	
Nicholas Smyth's - - - - -	12	Peter Ward's - - - - -	16	
Richard Tuny's - - - - -	24	James Griffin's - - - - -	12	
James Gunning's - - - - -	12	Oliver Joyce's - - - - -	4	
James Joyce's - - - - -	64	Domnick McHugo's - - - - -	16	
John Connelly's - - - - -	60	James Duggan's - - - - -	18	
Dr. Bodkin's - - - - -	16	Mrs. Wheeler's - - - - -	6	
Patt D'Arcy's - - - - -	44	Mrs. Barrett's - - - - -	12	
Mrs. Flatley's - - - - -	30	Michael Kelly's - - - - -	6	
		Patt Tarrell's - - - - -	20	
Shop-street, south side :		Domnick Doyle's - - - - -	14	
Miss Carr's - - - - -	10	Dennis Potter's - - - - -	14	
Ulrich Wubb's - - - - -	16	Mathew Clayton's - - - - -	16	
John Tierney's - - - - -	32	Michael Kelly's - - - - -	12	
Thomas McGuire's - - - - -	48	Patt Malone's - - - - -	32	

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

Streets, Houses, and Names of Occupants.	Annual Value.	Streets, Houses, and Names of Occupants.	Annual Value.
Middle-street, south side :	£.	Cross-street, east side :	£.
Anthony Skerrett's house - - - -	40	James Browne's, sea. house - - - -	32
Mrs. Donohu's - - - - -	24	Bartholomew O'Fisherty's - - - -	22
Miss Nolan's - - - - -	14	Lobdell's - - - - -	10
		Ditto - - - - -	10
Buttermilk-lane :		John Ford's - - - - -	6
James Joyce's - - - - -	32	Mrs. Mullin's - - - - -	40
Widow Kennedy's - - - - -	6	John Hall's - - - - -	10
		Laffy & Burk's - - - - -	32
Back-street, south side :		Martin Burke's - - - - -	20
Francis Fitzgerald's - - - - -	64	Regan & Keim's - - - - -	10
Thomas Joyce's - - - - -	16	Edward Scanton's - - - - -	30
Francis Fitzgerald's - - - - -	40		
Mrs. Martyn's - - - - -	40	Quay-street, north side :	
Thomas Lynch's - - - - -	10	Martin Hughes's - - - - -	32
Mr. Tallon's - - - - -	16	Michael Burke's - - - - -	12
Captain Satchwell's - - - - -	10	Mrs. Symcock's - - - - -	24
Mrs. Higgins's - - - - -	32	John Irwin's - - - - -	6
Bartholomew Tynn's - - - - -	30	Martin Dempsey's - - - - -	8
Denis Clasko's - - - - -	30	Peter Frenche's - - - - -	20
James Brown's, jun. - - - - -	30	John Madden's - - - - -	10
Constantine Sloper's - - - - -	16	Daniel Conside's - - - - -	14
Laurence Burke's - - - - -	20	Bartly O'Liver's - - - - -	16
Patt Eardley's - - - - -	8	Rev. Mr. Seymour's - - - - -	24
Charles O'Connor's - - - - -	16	Laurence M'Donogh's - - - - -	30
Mrs. O'Brien's - - - - -	10	Michael O'Brien's - - - - -	24
Michael Cody's - - - - -	10	J. Ulick Burke's - - - - -	10
Ditto - - - - -	10	Bartholomew O'Liver's - - - - -	8
James Morris's - - - - -	10	Myles Barke's - - - - -	16
Mr. Pilkington's - - - - -	20	Mrs. Inkir's - - - - -	4
John Atkinson's - - - - -	30	Mrs. Hughes's - - - - -	6
Richard Feby's - - - - -	12	Mrs. Comber's - - - - -	6
Commercial Bank - - - - -	100	Austin Grannh's - - - - -	16
Anthony Jourdan's - - - - -	16	Redmond Kelly's - - - - -	4
Captain Evans's - - - - -	20	Myles King's - - - - -	8
Captain A. Morris's - - - - -	10	Arthur Cousner's - - - - -	6
Spanish Parade :		James Conside's - - - - -	12
Captain A. Morris's - - - - -	10	John King's - - - - -	8
Captain Evan Evans's - - - - -	16	Thomas Hallam's - - - - -	12
		John Hallam's - - - - -	4
Quay-street :		Christopher York's - - - - -	8
William Clarke's - - - - -	12	Laurence M'Donogh's - - - - -	16
Richard Adams's - - - - -	20	Ann Townsend's - - - - -	6
Mr. Mason's - - - - -	8	Laurence M'Donogh's - - - - -	4
Andrew Clarke's - - - - -	8	William Higgins's - - - - -	4
Mr. Nich. Killians's - - - - -	16	Michael Daly's - - - - -	8
Mrs. Crow's - - - - -	4		
John Morris's - - - - -	8	East Gate :	
		Mr. O'Fisherty's - - - - -	20
Cross-street, west side.			
Bernard Corr's - - - - -	40	Merrick-square :	
James Sweeney's - - - - -	20	Michael Blood's - - - - -	48
William Rooney's - - - - -	36	Michael Killen's - - - - -	50
Martin Burke's - - - - -	20	John Goffry's - - - - -	40
Redmond Lees's - - - - -	16	John Killroy's - - - - -	10
William Burke's - - - - -	20	Ditto - - - - -	100
John Burke's - - - - -	12	Mr. Kirwan's - - - - -	20
John Kelly's - - - - -	8	Mrs. Barrett's - - - - -	16
Mr. Daniel Kerren's - - - - -	6	Miss Keogh's - - - - -	24
Thomas Nolan's - - - - -	6	Mrs. Leache's - - - - -	12
Harlow Dennis's - - - - -	22	Mrs. Conroy's - - - - -	20
		Free Press office - - - - -	16
		James Joyce's - - - - -	40
		Stephen Lee's - - - - -	4
		James Costello's - - - - -	32

Streets, Houses, and Names of Occupants.	Annual Value.	Streets, Houses, and Names of Occupants.	Annual Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
Merrick-square—continued.		College-road :		
Captain Denis's house	16	Mr. M'Donnell's house	40	
James Kenny's	18	John Keenan's	16	
Mrs. Mahan's	20	Patt Doonan's	16	
Mrs. Malton's	24	John Kelly's	6	
William Mathews's	16	Patt Clarke's	12	
Miss Grace's	10	John Sullivan's	4	
Bank of Ireland	140	Austin Clarke's	8	
A. M'Namara	104	Martin Geoghagan's	6	
College-road :		Mr. Anthony Craven's	30	
George Symcock's	12	Anthony Craven's	8	
Thomas Trench's	40	John Kelly's	6	
Ditto	16	John Cavanagh's	6	
Hugh Crane's	4	William Clarke's	32	
Patt. Kain's	14	Bohermore :		
Ditto	10	Widow O'Shaughnessy's	8	
John Wheelan's	10	Widow Martin's	8	
Philip O'Connor's	10	Flan. Keay's	4	
Mr. M'Donnell's	24	John Wheeler's	8	
Ditto	24	John Saker's	8	
Ditto	24	Mr. Rowland's	8	
Dock :		James Joyce's	6	
Mr. Mulloy's	6	John Hanna's	8	
James Burke's	6	James O'Connor's	30	
Thomas Lynch's	6	Doctor Veitch's	48	
Rear of Town-wall :		Mrs. Martyn's	32	
Henry Townsend's	24	Mrs. Mitchell's	32	
Laurence M'Donough's	16	Colonel French's	32	
Ditto	14	John Morris's	16	
Ditto	10	Mail Coach-office	32	
Deals Sullivan's	10	Rosemary-lane :		
Meyrick-square :		Mr. M'Namara's	6	
Arthur Ireland	48	Mr. Joe Haverly's	14	
John Ireland	40	Mr. Barry Canniff's	12	
Ditto	40	Mr. James Darcy's	12	
Provincial Bank	120	Mr. Henchan's	4	
Higgins's	32	Mr. Remy's	4	
Charles Costello's	30	Mr. Berningham's	4	
Captain Bruce's	30	Martin Halsean's	4	
Mr. Campbell's	24	Mr. William Fary's	4	
John Scott's	28	New Police Barrack	20	
John Gealy's	60	George M'Namara's	12	
National Bank	30	Henry Duggan's	10	
Mr. Pendergast	24	William Harty's	6	
Mr. Fitzmaurice's	20	Patt Malloy's	6	
Mrs. O'Connor's	24	Laurence Beegan's	4	
Rowland Stephens's	24	James Hossack's	20	
John Scott's	30	Benjamin Thomas's	12	
East Gate :		Joseph Bath's	16	
Mr. Kelly's	40	Ditto	40	
Mr. Trench's	20	North Suburbs :		
James Chambers's	32	Mrs. Joyce's	28	
Mr. Carroll's	50	Patt Burke's	12	
Habert Bark's	24	Ditto	8	
Patt Hughes's	24	John Francis Blake's	24	
Mrs. Sheridan's	32	Widow Manning's	6	
Barnett's	60	John Holland's	16	
John Gealy's	32	John Scully's	32	
Mrs. Raine's	24	Doctor Perrin's	16	
Mr. Usher's	22	Anthony Skerrett's	16	
		Anthony Donelan's	16	

Appendix (G)

Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

Streets, Houses, and Names of Occupants.	Annual Value.	Streets, Houses, and Names of Occupants.	Annual Value.
North Suburbs—continued.		Dominick-street—continued.	
Andrew Blake's house - - -	£. 24	Denis Corcoran's house - - -	£. 24
Nicholas Burke's - - -	16	Edward Tolan's - - -	20
Pat Turke's - - -	6	Edward Tolan's - - -	16
John Turke's - - -	6	Miss Colcott's - - -	40
Charles Browne's - - -	14	Mark Lynch's - - -	56
Dominick O'Shaughnessy's - - -	24	Mr. O'Connor's - - -	56
James Gunning's - - -	6	Police Barrack - - -	32
John Gunning's - - -	24	Robert Pass's - - -	32
James Gunning's - - -	88	Mr. Rush's - - -	40
Ditto - - -	40	Doctor Gray's - - -	40
Austin Driscoll's - - -	4	Mr. Ellis's - - -	24
Widow Driscoll's - - -	4		
David Henry's - - -	20	Fair Hill :	
		John Carter's - - -	14
Nuns' Island :		Myles Burke's - - -	16
John Coghlan's - - -	10		
William Brady's - - -	20	Ball's Bridge :	
John Connelly's - - -	30	Anthony Concanon's - - -	14
Forbes & Irwin's - - -	26	Frank Connor's - - -	10
Pat M'Donough's - - -	40	Martin Morris's - - -	28
Ditto - - -	40	Edward Killian's - - -	96
Michael Forde's - - -	4	Mrs. Martyn's - - -	32
Mr. Rush's - - -	24	Edmond Blake's - - -	32
Henry Cahell's - - -	24	Samuel Shone's - - -	24
John Thomas's - - -	28	Mrs. Young's - - -	24
Ditto - - -	12	John Dondan's - - -	8
Pat Newell's - - -	20		
		Talusbeg :	
Bridge-street :		James Tolan's - - -	32
Mr. Hyne's - - -	24	John Brabazon's - - -	16
Kerrigan's - - -	24	James Donohue's - - -	6
William Murphy's - - -	14	John Kain's - - -	26
Ditto - - -	26	Mathew Faherty's - - -	20
Martin Sydon's - - -	12	Ditto - - -	20
Pat Newell's - - -	14	Collector Riely's - - -	112
		Dominick Coane's - - -	6
Dominick-street :		Joseph Leonard's - - -	20
Mrs. Burke's - - -	24	John Morriac's - - -	14
John Costello's - - -	26	Ditto - - -	20
John Walsh's - - -	10	Mrs. Matthew's - - -	8
Mrs. Birmingham's - - -	48	Edward Mitchell's - - -	4
Doctor Staunton's - - -	48		
Mrs. O'Connor's - - -	24	New Road :	
James Lynch's - - -	56	Keiwans & M'Lachlan's - - -	20
Doctor Settle's - - -	56	Mr. M'Donough's - - -	64
Mrs. Burk's - - -	56		
Bealop Brown's - - -	36	Charter Side :	
Doctor Whistler's - - -	56	Pat Lnu's - - -	4
Mrs. Foster's - - -	28	Mrs. Butler's - - -	10
Henry Scott's - - -	14	David Mitchell's - - -	140
Pat Rooney's - - -	38	Robert Stephens's - - -	28
John Joyce's - - -	16	Mrs. Hughes's - - -	40
Nicholas Kearney's - - -	16	Excise Office - - -	60
Pat Joyce's - - -	16		

John M. O'Hara,
Deputy Clerk of the Peace.

A VALUATION of HOUSES, &c. in the Town of *Lisburn*, taken by Order of the Police Commissioners.

Rest.	N A M E.	Assessment.	Rest.	N A M E.	Assessment.
	Castle-street :			Castle-st.—cont ^d .	
£. s. d.		£. s. d.	£. s. d.		£. s. d.
16 -	Miss Fox - - -	- 12 -	6 -	John Macatney - -	- 3 -
40 -	James Hogg - - -	2 - -	6 -	James Johnson - -	- 3 -
40 -	Dr. Thompson - -	2 - -	6 -	Miss Turner - - -	- 3 -
16 -	William M'Dowell -	- 12 -	6 -	William Graham - -	- 3 -
15 -	John M'Connell - -	- 11 3	6 -	Thomas M'Keown - -	- 3 -
15 -	Adson M'Clure - -	- 11 3	7 -	David Hammond - -	- 3 6
12 -	George Morrow - -	- 9 -	6 -	Henry Baily - - -	- 3 -
12 -	Robert Thompson -	- 9 -	7 -	H. Mullolland, jun.	- 2 6
8 -	G. Stephenson's office	- 4 -	7 -	John Newell - - -	- 3 6
30 -	Geo. Stephenson - -	1 10 -	30 -	J. G. Richardson - -	1 10 -
8 -	Thomas Forrest - -	- 4 -	18 -	Mrs. Younghusband	- 12 6
20 -	Robert Wallace - -	1 - -	40 -	John Owden and	2 - -
22 -	Charles Shields - -	1 2 -		store.	
8 -	Miss Wilson - - -	- 4 -	35 -	John Richardson - -	1 15 -
30 -	Samuel Gamble - -	1 10 -	35 -	Vacant - - -	1 15 -
30 -	William Dillon - -	1 10 -	30 -	Francis Weldon - -	1 10 -
10 -	W. Dillon's office -	- 7 6	10 -	Vacant - - -	- 7 6
10 -	Ms. Wilson - - -	- 7 6	50 -	Mrs. Trail - - -	2 10 -
75 -	T. J. Smyth - - -	3 15 -	25 -	Lucas Waring - - -	1 6 -
55 -	Miss Fletcher - - -	2 15 -	52 -	John Binney - - -	2 12 -
14 -	Hann. M'Kay - - -	- 10 6	52 -	Rev. E. Cupples - -	2 12 -
60 -	Mrs. Gregg - - -	3 - -	14 -	Sorby & Calwell - -	- 10 6
45 -	Rev. E. Cordner - -	2 5 -	12 -	Mrs. Philips - - -	- 9 -
100 -	Rev. Dean Stannus -	5 - -	25 -	Benjamin Neely,	1 5 -
30 -	Marquis of Hert-	1 10 -		and academy.	
60 -	Dr. Charles Cup-	3 - -	15 -	Mrs. M'Intyre - - -	- 11 3
	ples & D. Legg - -		12 -	Miss Reil - - -	- 9 -
60 -	Rev. Edw. Leslie - -	3 - -	17 -	Hugh Boyd - - -	- 12 9
45 -	Major Stewart - -	2 5 -	18 -	Jac. Conne's house	- 13 6
50 -	Dr. W. Thompson - -	2 10 -	15 -	James Moorcroft - -	- 11 3
80 -	William Childbeck -	4 - -	6 -	Subscription bakery	- 11 3
25 -	J. & J. Richardson's	1 6 -	20 -	H. Bannister - - -	- 3 -
	office.		12 -	John M'Dowell - -	1 - -
12 -	Miss Crawford - -	- 9 -		Richard Murray - -	- 9 -
8 -	James Murray - -	- 4 -			
10 -	James Knox - - -	- 7 6	6 -	Johnson's entry :	
10 -	A. Kirkwood - - -	- 7 6	6 -	Thomas Magennis - -	- 3 -
50 -	Dr. Stewart - - -	2 10 -	6 -	William Gorman - -	- 3 -
18 -	Miss Montgomery - -	- 13 6	10 -	William Johnson,	- 7 6
50 -	Mrs. Hogg - - -	2 10 -		and shop.	
5 -	William Chapman - -	- 2 6		Ten smaller houses	- -
5 -	John Patterson - -	- 2 6		let in different	
20 -	Miss Jones - - -	1 - -		apartments by Ed.	
60 -	County Infirmary - -	3 - -		Johnson, esq.	
14 -	Thomas Major - - -	- 10 6			
16 -	George Boomer - - -	- 12 -		Market-square :	
12 -	John Vernon - - -	- 9 9	75 -	John Crossley, hot-	3 15 -
25 -	Samuel Herron - - -	1 5 -		tel and stables.	
16 -	Miss Boomer - - -	- 12 -	30 -	John Greaves - - -	1 10 -
14 -	Reyn. Boomer - - -	- 10 6	40 -	Hugh Seeds - - -	2 - -
15 -	John G. Rogers - - -	- 11 3	18 -	John Reid - - -	- 13 6
20 -	Henry Mulholland - -	1 - -	25 -	John Chapman - - -	1 5 -
6 -	— Magee - - -	- 2 6	16 -	Edward S. Still - -	- 12 -
5 -	— Reynolds - - -	- 2 6	10 -	Francis Farrell - -	- 7 6
5 -	John M'Comisky - -	- 2 6	30 -	Thomas Mussen - -	1 10 -
5 -	— Woods - - -	- 2 6	40 -	Matthew Mussen - -	2 - -
80 -	Mrs. Casement and	4 - -	39 -	George Pelsa - - -	1 12 -
	grounds.		32 -	Robert Mussen - -	1 12 -
120 -	Messrs. Richardson	6 - -	35 -	John Millar - - -	1 15 -
	& Co., bleach mills.		25 -	Michael Savage - -	1 6 -
30 -	John Millar's corn	1 10 -	10 -	John Sicheerwood - -	- 7 6
	mill.		35 -	Robert M'Clure - -	1 15 -
6 -	Dr. Turner - - -	- 3 -	22 -	John P. Lappin - -	1 2 -

Res.	N A M E.	Assessm.	Res.	N A M E.	Assessm.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
£. s.		£. s. d.	£. s.		£. s. d.	
80	Market-sq.—contd. William Graham, brewery, ten-yard, &c.	4 - -	15 -	Bow-st.—contd. William Fraser -	- 11 3	
25 -	H. & J. Jefferson -	1 5 -	15 -	William Boomer -	- 11 3	
25 -	John Singleton -	1 5 -	15 -	George Wilson -	- 11 3	
10 -	Doito, office -	- 7 5	15 -	Ralph Walsh -	- 9 -	
16 -	William Singleton -	- 12 -	6 -	Mrs. Burrows -	- 9 -	
20 -	Erskine Neely -	1 - -	6 -	Miss Clarke -	- 11 3	
20 -	William Murray -	1 - -	6 -	R. M'Guinness -	- 2 6	
35 -	Thomas Beckett -	1 15 -	22 -	Ar. Moore -	- 3 -	
25 -	David Mack -	1 5 -	10 -	Henry Bell -	1 2 -	
25 -	Dr. Wethered -	1 5 -	15 -	Henry Hare -	- 7 6	
10 -	Thomas Stewart -	- 7 5	30 -	William Elliot -	- 11 3	
18 -	Dr. M'Donnell -	- 13 6		Henry Mulholland	1 10 -	
45 -	William Coulson -	2 5 -	5 -	Antrim-lane :		
10 -	Dr. Kelso -	- 7 6	5 -	Deonis Connor -	- 3 -	
19 -	Mrs. Masgrave -	- 9 -	5 -	Dr. Birney -	- 3 -	
8 -	George M'Alco -	- 4 -	5 -	Ever Phillips -	- 3 -	
30 -	George Major -	1 10 -	5 -	B. Dugan -	- 2 5	
20 -	John Moore -	1 - -	5 -	William Curry -	- 2 6	
35 -	Doito, King's-arms hotel.	1 15 -	5 -	— Maguire -	- 2 6	
15 -	James M'Connell -	- 12 -	5 -	H. M'Cartney -	- 2 6	
12 -	James Murray -	- 9 -	5 -	Francis Quinn -	- 2 5	
25 -	Mrs. A. Clarke -	1 5 -	5 -	M. Magin -	- 2 5	
20 -	Miss Mussen -	1 - -	5 -	Mrs. Dooney -	- 2 6	
25 -	James Mussen -	1 5 -	5 -	William Walker -	- 2 6	
32 -	Thomas Gillespie -	1 12 -	5 -	Mrs. Neill -	- 2 5	
45 -	Messrs. Coolson -	2 5 -	5 -	Richard Allen -	- 2 6	
30 -	Toni M'Keown -	1 10 -	5 -	P. Donnelly -	- 2 6	
18 -	Robert Bailly -	- 13 6	6 -	James Irving -	- 2 6	
18 -	Robert Lawson -	- 13 6	10 -	John Havron -	- 2 5	
18 -	Vacant -	- 13 5	5 -	George Cahoon -	- 3 -	
25 -	James Hagan -	1 5 -		John M'Loughlin -	- 7 5	
25 -	John M'Harrey -	1 5 -	15 -	John Hamilton -	- 2 6	
15 -	Mrs. M'Antrey -	- 12 -	8 -	Bow-street :		
15 -	Thomas Dugan -	- 12 -	8 -	E. M'Court -	- 11 3	
15 -	Ar. M'Gusk -	- 12 -	8 -	Thomas Thompson -	- 4 -	
20 -	James Philips -	1 - -	8 -	Gilbert Armstrong -	- 4 -	
28 -	Thomas Johnston -	1 8 -	18 -	James Stewart -	- 9 -	
15 -	Alexander Lawson -	- 11 3	8 -	Miss Reid -	- 4 -	
5 -	T. Carleton, cellar	- 2 6	18 -	John Pennington -	- 13 6	
15 -	John Deveny -	- 11 3	90 -	William Bell -	1 - -	
15 -	William Burrows -	- 11 3	90 -	Miss Russell -	1 - -	
18 -	James Ward -	- 13 5	30 -	John Hicks -	1 10 -	
32 -	A. Harlow & Co. -	1 12 -	10 -	William Alister -	- 7 6	
32 -	George Duncan -	1 12 -	22 -	Robert M'Call -	1 2 -	
20 -	John Lawson -	1 - -	12 -	Mrs. Hume -	- 9 -	
5 -	Cellar -	- 2 5	40 -	Robert Stewart -	2 - -	
15 -	Alexander Lawson -	- 11 3	60 -	Mrs. J. Richardson	3 - -	
	Jackson's-lane :		18 -	F. H. O'Flaherty -	- 13 6	
5 -	John Lannon -	- 2 6	14 -	Thomas Shanley -	- 10 5	
7 -	Mrs. Hancock -	- 3 6	5 -	Jace Smith -	- 2 6	
5 -	Hugh Kelly -	- 2 5	5 -	James Davis -	- 2 6	
	Bow-street :		5 -	John Singleton -	- 3 -	
50 -	David Beatty -	2 10 -	5 -	Alex. Toulerton -	- 2 6	
15 -	Miss Greer -	- 11 3	5 -	John Magee -	- 2 5	
10 -	George Thompson -	- 7 5	6 -	John Toe -	- 3 -	
16 -	Mrs. J. Beatty -	- 12 -	8 -	James M'Caan -	- 3 -	
35 -	Parker Major -	1 15 -	6 -	James Linn -	- 3 -	
10 -	J. Titterington -	- 7 5	35 -	Vacant -	1 15 -	
18 -	Hugh M'Call -	- 13 5	5 -	Edward Partridge -	- 3 -	
80 -	Henry F. Higginson and offices.	4 - -	6 -	Robert Galloway -	- 3 -	
25 -	Samuel Douglas -	1 5 -	6 -	James Hanna -	- 3 -	
18 -	Robert Cordner -	- 13 6	5 -	Alexander Clarke -	- 2 6	
20 -	Thomas Mussen -	1 - -	5 -	Thomas Rogers -	- 2 6	
10 -	Thomas Mairs -	- 7 5	20 -	Police-office	1 - -	
			30 -	Miss Falcon -	1 10 -	
			12 -	D. Anderson -	- 9 -	
			12 -	Const. Hanna -	- 9 -	
			13 -	George Rollias -	- 9 9	

Appendix (G.)
 Houses in Towns
 which return
 Members to Par-
 liament.

Rate.	N A M E.	Assessment.	Rate.	N A M E.	Assessment
£. s. d.		£. s. d.	£. s. d.		£. s. d.
	Bow-st.—contd.			Bow-st.—contd.	
12	Mrs. Felton	9	6	Wm. Magee	3
6	Thomas Johnston	3	18	Dennis Smith	13 6
8	John Magennis	4	18	Mich. Linn	13 6
20	Rev. H. Smith	1	18	A. Macartney	13 6
10	William Collins	7 6	18	John Belshaw	13 6
10	Thomas Patterson	7 6	16	— Godfrey	12
6	John Burns	3	18	Jos. Moore	13 6
6	William Matthews	3	20	Geo. Boomer	1
6	Robert Townley	3			
6	Alexander Pelan	3		Old Shambles:	
6	Anthony Hull	3	8	Thomas M'Beide	4
6	Isaac King	3	5	Wm. M'Cloy	2 6
6	John Burke	3	5	John Cudner	9 6
6	William Wilson	3	6	Wm. Stephenson	3
6	David Miller	3	9	Mrs. M'Clean	4 6
8	Henry Hicks	4	9	Mrs. M'Harry	4 6
5	Nich. Dillon	2 6	9	Jas. Lindsay	4 6
8	Mrs. Lamont	4	9	Pat. Doyle	4 6
5	John Burgess	2 6	12	Ch. Weldon & shop	9
6	Owen Moogan	2 6	8	Mrs. Clendinning	4
6	D. Murray	2 6	5	J. M'Kee	2 6
5	S. M'Connell	2 6	7	Rob. Thompson	3 6
5	Edw. Walker	2 6	12	John Allister	9
7	Jas. M'Guigan	3 6	10	John Wheeler	7 6
6	Bern. Woods	3	12	John Herrom	9
8	Mrs. R. Carleton	4	10	Say. Kane	7 6
30	John C. Hill	1 10	5	Edw. Thompson	2 6
15	Mrs. John Garrett	11 3	6	Rob. Gray	3
5	Mrs. Scott	2 6	5	Thomas Magee	2 6
10	H. Sorby	7 6	5	John White	2 6
6	R. M'Keown	3	5	Rob. Graham	2 6
10	Kernahan's houses and entry.	7 6			
5	James Hodgins	2 6	5	Haslem's-lane:	
5	James Falloon	2 6	5	Ar. Dorn	2 6
5	Henry Hillan	2 6	7	Young Dickey	2 6
7	Widow Hodgins	3 6	5	James Corkin	3 6
8	James Kennedy	4	5	Rob. Munce	2 6
15	Rd. Boomer	11 3	5	Miss Carleton	2 6
10	Mercer's house	7 6	5	H. M'Mullen	2 6
16	James M'Clure	11 3	5	B. M'Cracken	2 6
25	A. Brownlee	1 5	5	John Hamilton	2 6
12	Edw. Magee	9	5	Thomas Savage	2 6
10	John Brownlee	7 6		E. M'Donnell	2 6
10	Wm. J. Spence	7 6			
12	Rob. Dixon	9	20	Bridge-street:	
50	W. Whirls & stables	2 10	25	Hsl. Nelson	1
8	W. J. Martin	4	15	R. Mulholland	1 5
8	John O'Neill	4	15	W. Mulholland	11 3
10	Geo. Armstrong	7 6	12	Wm. Woods	11 3
25	Wm. Doonan	1 6	12	Hemphry Boyd	9
15	Rich. Millis	11 3	12	Jas. Stewart	9
9	John Gally	4 6	16	Rob. Irving	9
27	John Boomer	1 7	26	Vacant	12
10	J. Thompson's spirit store.	7 6	24	John Woods	1 4
			20	Vacant	1
25	J. Thompson's house	1 5	14	Wm. M'Loughlin	10 6
28	R. & J. Jefferson	1 8	20	John Gillias	1
22	Wm. Smith	1 2	12	Jas. Crawford	9
18	Geo. H. Sefton	13 6	10	John Young	7 6
22	Henry M'Carry	1 2	12	R. Mulholland's store	9
10	J. B. Kennedy, office	7 5	5	J. Miller's coal-yard	3
25	Edw. Gibson	1 6	40	H. Mulholland, and timber-yard.	2
16	Mrs. Scandret	12	15	Ha. Mulholland	11 3
90	C. W. Alderdice, and tan-yard.	1	40	Dr. Hancock	2
			16	Miss Hancock	12
26	Mrs. Dawson	1 5	26	Vacant	12
90	Geo. Megarry	1	14	Rev. W. Armstrong	10 6
8	D. Magenty	4	120	J. & D. Boyd, and vitrif works.	6

Rate.	N A M E.	Assessment.	Rate.	N A M E.	Assessment.	Appendix (G.)
£. s. d.	Bridge-st.—cont ^d .	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	Piper-hill—cont ^d .	£. s. d.	Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
7 -	Alex. Magill -	- 3 6	5 -	Jas. M'Dougall -	- 2 6	
7 -	Jas. Magowan -	- 3 6	5 -	Wm. Stewart -	- 2 6	
7 -	H. Kelly -	- 3 6	6 -	W. M'Aten -	- 2 6	
7 -	David Finlay -	- 3 6	5 -	Cath. Richardson -	- 2 6	
18 -	Jas. Domes -	- 13 6	5 -	Wm. Brown -	- 2 6	
5 -	John Murphy -	- 2 6	5 -	Wm. Hill -	- 2 6	
5 -	Jas. Trimble -	- 2 6	5 -	John Dogan -	- 2 6	
6 -	Mrs. Cosgrave -	- 3 -	5 -	J. Halliday -	- 2 6	
8 -	Rob. Edgar -	- 4 -	5 -	John Cahoon -	- 2 6	
12 -	Wm. Edgar -	- 9 -	5 -	Jas. Thompson -	- 2 6	
8 -	Mrs. Hall -	- 4 -	5 -	Jas. Hogg -	- 2 6	
8 -	Geo. Dugan -	- 4 -	5 -	Wm. Ramsey -	- 2 6	
12 -	Say. Clarke -	- 9 -	7 -	Pat. Quigley -	- 3 6	
12 -	Jas. Cree -	- 9 -	5 -	Hugh M'Cann -	- 2 6	
12 -	Mrs. M'Ken -	- 9 -	6 -	Widow Wilson -	- 3 -	
10 -	John M'Connell -	- 7 6	6 -	S. Halliday -	- 3 -	
15 -	Geo. Wilson -	- 11 3	5 -	Owen M'Connell -	- 2 6	
6 -	John Smith -	- 3 -	5 -	John Rogan -	- 2 6	
6 -	Adam Calvert -	- 3 -	5 -	Isaac Bell -	- 2 6	
6 -	Widow Fisher -	- 3 -	6 -	Hill Crothers -	- 3 -	
14 -	John Wood's store -	- 10 6	6 -	Charles Magee -	- 3 -	
7 -	John Finlay -	- 3 6	6 -	Jas. Farrell -	- 3 -	
10 -	Wm. Major -	- 7 6	6 -	Sam. Tate -	- 2 6	
15 -	Geo. Simpson -	- 11 3	6 -	John Milligen -	- 2 6	
15 -	Mrs. Serby -	- 11 3	6 -	Sam. Long -	- 2 6	
15 -	Mrs. A. J. Clarke -	- 11 3	5 -	John M'Claghen -	- 2 6	
15 -	Sam. Pelan -	- 11 3	6 -	John Curran -	- 2 6	
12 -	R. Alister -	- 9 -	5 -	Jos. Thornton -	- 2 6	
15 -	Wm. Ross -	- 11 3	5 -	Alex. Lawson's store -	- 2 6	
15 -	Clark's house -	- 11 3	5 -	Ditto, stables -	- 2 6	
15 -	Thos. Tinsley -	- 11 3	6 -	Jos. M'Cabe -	- 3 -	
10 -	John Anderson -	- 7 6	100 -	Messes, Coulson's dunnak manufac- tory, in different places.	6 -	
7 -	George Morgan -	- 3 6				
9 -	Joy. Glenn -	- 4 6				
14 -	Rich. Foote -	- 10 6				
10 -	Henry Bell -	- 7 6				
6 -	Vacant.	-				
25 -	John Woods, jun. -	1 5 -		Back-lane:		
16 -	Wm. Smith -	- 12 -	5 -	John Maze -	- 2 6	
16 -	John Ruddleick -	- 12 -	5 -	George Cotter -	- 2 6	
32 -	Mrs. Thompson -	1 12 -	5 -	John Bowden -	- 2 6	
30 -	J. Patterson -	1 10 -	5 -	John Duffy -	- 2 6	
10 -	Vacant.	-	6 -	Wm. Anderson -	- 2 6	
16 -	Alex. Bell -	- 12 -	6 -	Robert Parkinson -	- 2 6	
5 -	A. M'Kinley, cellar -	- 2 6	6 -	John Long -	- 2 6	
20 -	Geo. Bell -	1 -	6 -	D. M'Laughlin -	- 2 6	
32 -	Mrs. A. Bell -	1 12 -	5 -	— Robinson -	- 2 6	
			6 -	John Coan -	- 2 6	
			5 -	Widow Conn -	- 2 6	
	Piper-hill:					
6 -	Widow Grant -	- 3 -				
10 -	Wm. Long -	- 7 6		Cross-row:		
6 -	Rob. Miller -	- 3 -	7 -	Nath. Shaw -	- 3 6	
10 -	Thos. Newburn -	- 7 6	6 -	S. O'Donnell -	- 2 6	
6 -	Vacant -	- 3 -				
5 -	Sam. Wilson -	- 2 6		Linen Hall-street:		
6 -	A. Lawson, jun. -	- 3 -	10 -	James Munce -	- 7 6	
5 -	M. M'Elroy -	- 2 6	5 -	D. Fleming -	- 2 6	
5 -	Geo. Graham -	- 2 6	10 -	R. Mulholland's store -	- 7 6	
5 -	John Matthews -	- 2 6	5 -	Wm. Dugan -	- 2 6	
7 -	Sam. Fleming -	- 3 6	5 -	John Tulmen -	- 2 6	
7 -	P. Thornton -	- 3 6	5 -	Fras. Abbott -	- 2 6	
5 -	Jas. Gilmore -	- 2 6	8 -	J. Reaney's spirit-house -	- 4 -	
5 -	John Laverty -	- 2 6	5 -	Wm. Anderson -	- 2 6	

Sworn before me this 13th day of March 1837, being a true valuation of the houses in the town of Lisbarn according to the best of our knowledge and belief.

P. J. Smyth, J. P.

8 April 1837.

Wm. Gregg, Seneschal.

Appendix (G.)

Houses in Town
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

LONDONDERRY.

No.	Street and Occupant.	Valu.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Valu.
	Bishop-street:	£. s.		Bishop-street—east^d.	£. s.
1	James M'Candless - -	75 -	48	Andrew Gulbraith - -	12 -
3	Allen Laughlin - - -	49 -	46	— Hamilton - - -	18 -
5	Samuel Walker - - -	80 -	44	Thomas Laughlin - -	25 -
7	William Thompson - -	55 -	42	Edward M'Glinchey -	39 -
9	William Gamble - - -	55 -	36	John M'Cormick - - -	60 -
11	James Miller - - - -	59 -	38	John M'Cormick - - -	16 -
13	Hugh Gallaher - - -	55 -	34	— Fountain - - - -	45 -
15	James Glenn - - - -	50 -	32	Joshua Gillespie - -	50 -
17	Mrs. Fisher - - - -	40 -	30	Dean Gough - - - -	100 -
19	W. R. and J. Little - -	50 -	-	Rev. Mr. Monsell - -	45 -
21	James M'Candless - -	25 -	-	Robert Campbell - -	40 -
23	William Caldwell - - -	70 -	-	Edward Flinnaginn -	45 -
-	George Dugal - - - -	35 -	-	John Rankin - - - -	50 -
-	Bishop's Palace - - -	400 -	-	Andrew Moore - - -	90 -
31	Paul Gillespie - - - -	35 -	-	Samuel Gilliland - -	60 -
33	Thomas Brown - - - -	10 -	14	William Swares - - -	80 -
37	Patrick Halliday - - -	45 -	-	Samuel Dwyer - - -	60 -
39	Police barrack - - - -	30 -	-	William Ashton - - -	45 -
41	John M'Bride - - - -	25 -	-	T. & M. Mulholland -	100 -
45	John Dugal - - - -	25 -	-	Neal Donahy - - - -	15 -
47	John M'Bride - - - -	15 -	-	Cathrine Hibbets - -	18 -
49	William Kelly - - - -	20 -	-	William M'Menemon -	20 -
51	Thomas Murray - - - -	70 -	-		
53	John O'Donnell - - - -	15 -	-	Society-street:	
59	Joseph French - - - -	15 -	1	John Glenn - - - -	30 -
63	John M'Divitt - - - -	90 -	3	William Lee - - - -	25 -
65	John Murray - - - -	18 -	9	James Hydes - - - -	10 -
69	Ellice & Watt - - - -	16 -	12	William Morrison - -	15 -
77	Patrick Nugent - - - -	15 -	13	Marcus M'Laughlin -	35 -
79	James M'Laughlin - -	18 -	14	James Hydes - - - -	18 -
81	James Gillespie - - -	25 -	15	Timothy Foy - - - -	55 -
83	Mrs. Shannon - - - -	12 -	-	Mrs. Edgerton - - -	18 -
85	Samuel Reid - - - -	10 -	-	Timothy Foy - - - -	50 -
87	John Battersby - - - -	10 -	12	Charles M'Shane - - -	18 -
-	Robert Bovaird - - - -	10 -	10	Anthony Donk - - - -	90 -
91	James Cochran - - - -	18 -	4	Michael Roedy - - -	20 -
93	James Jones - - - -	25 -	6	John Dean - - - -	20 -
95	William M'Clare - - -	10 -	3	James Nellis - - - -	10 -
97	John Galtner - - - -	10 -	-		
99	John Meally - - - -	12 -	-	Stable-lane:	
103	Alexander M'Crabb - -	10 -	1	David Hamilton - - -	80 -
-	Bishop's garden - - -	195 -	3	William Steele - - -	12 -
140	James Alexander - - -	35 -	3	Richard Babinaton -	15 -
140	Francis M'Daid - - - -	12 -	-	Cunningham's-lane:	
137	Samuel Poner - - - -	10 -	-	Paul Gillespie - - -	10 -
136	Daniel Doherty - - - -	10 -	-		
122	Charles Gilkie - - - -	10 -	-	Cunningham's-row:	
105	Ezekiel M'Garvie - - -	12 -	-	Paul Gillespie - - -	15 -
119	Thomas M'Fadden - - -	15 -	1	Rev. Mr. Seymour - -	18 -
118	John Fullerton - - - -	10 -	9	— Sethan - - - -	18 -
110	Cornelius Kennedy - -	10 -	3	John Colboun - - - -	18 -
100	William Campbell - - -	10 -	4	Miss Horner - - - -	18 -
94	James Porter - - - -	15 -	5	Mrs. Blackball - - -	22 -
96	Richard Morton - - - -	16 -	6	Miss Tibbie - - - -	25 -
88	Miss Butler - - - -	10 -	7		
80	John M'Mouegal - - - -	10 -	-	Long-tower:	
74	James M'Kema - - - -	10 -	-	John Haggarty - - -	12 -
72	James M'Candless - -	10 -	1	Andrew Molested - -	12 -
70	John M'Colloagh - - -	10 -	3	John Boyle - - - -	15 -
66	Mrs. M'Garrie - - - -	22 -	-	James M'Candless - -	50 -
58	Robert Love - - - -	15 -	-		
56	John Sweeney - - - -	10 -	-	Nailor's-row:	
64	John M'Dermott - - -	10 -	-	David Hamilton - - -	15 -
52	David Young - - - -	13 -	-	James Mehan - - - -	10 -
50	Daniel M'Daid - - - -	12 -	-	James Mehan - - - -	90 -

No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.	Appendix (G.)
	Fountain-street:	£. s.		Ferry Quay-st.—contd.	£. s.	Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
108	George Buchanan -	18 -		Marshall and Caldwell -	60 -	
105	John M'Onegal -	18 -		David Huleston -	85 -	
104	— Kinkhead -	10 -		Joseph Adams -	80 -	
103	Michael Doherty -	10 -		— Smyth -	30 -	
96	James Miller -	25 -		Moses Seem -	30 -	
95	Joseph Love -	10 -		William Rowan -	20 -	
—	John M'Carte -	15 -	5	Robert Waters -	30 -	
93	Robert Simpson -	35 -		Joseph Scott -	16 -	
92	Mrs. Nolan -	25 -		Henry Stewart -	10 -	
—	James Macky -	50 -		Miss Downing -	10 -	
85	James Stirling -	18 -				
87	Henry Savage -	10 -		Pamp-street:		
91	James Kerr -	14 -		Dr. Hare -	55 -	
93	James Daly -	15 -	1	— Macky -	18 -	
	Church-wall:		3	John Quigg -	15 -	
1	Mrs. Gregg -	17 -	4	John M'Clare -	70 -	
9	Mrs. Campbell -	15 -	5	Conolly M. Lecky -	80 -	
3	William Ellis -	25 -	9	James Mansaroon -	30 -	
	St. Columb's-court:		11	Miss Ferguson -	35 -	
4	Mrs. Kelly -	15 -	13	William Ashton -	35 -	
3	Mrs. Renwick -	25 -	15	James Gregg -	80 -	
2	William Huffington -	28 -	17	Oliver Bond -	35 -	
1	Francis Rogan -	20 -	19	George Franks -	35 -	
	London-street:		21	Miss Young -	40 -	
1	Lindsey and Little -	120 -	22	Mrs. Darcus -	50 -	
2	Charles Doherty -	12 -	23	Andrew Bond -	45 -	
3	Mrs. M'Ilwain -	15 -	24	David Gilmour -	90 -	
4	John Doherty -	15 -	25	Mrs. Slack -	45 -	
5	David Miller -	22 -	26	Rt. Rev. Dr. M'Laughlin -	35 -	
—	Dr. Caldwell -	10 -	27	Miss Lecky -	40 -	
—	New school-house -	40 -	28	Dr. Miller -	50 -	
—	Mr. Williamson -	20 -	29	William Wallen -	60 -	
5	E. Blair -	10 -	30	Mrs. Burch -	140 -	
7	George Franks -	12 -	31	Thomas Gallaher -	25 -	
8	Rev. Henry Mardock -	20 -	32	Samuel Crawford -	25 -	
9	Miss Civil -	18 -	33	James Walker -	35 -	
10	Miss Weld -	22 -	34	Miss Burnet -	25 -	
11	Miss Montgomery -	22 -		Artillery-lane:		
12	Mrs. Warren -	22 -	1	Mrs. Brown -	10 -	
	Ferry Quay-street:		2	Andrew Stirling -	10 -	
1	Mrs. M'Colgan -	30 -	3	George Begley -	10 -	
2	Thomas Collins -	25 -	4	Miss Hunter -	12 -	
3	Dr. Esnes -	70 -	5	William Stewart -	12 -	
4	William Moore -	15 -	6	William Cook -	40 -	
7	Mosson Herapton -	40 -	7	James Campbell -	15 -	
—	William M'Clerran -	25 -	8	Joseph Stirling -	10 -	
9	William Steen -	55 -	9	Mrs. Goe -	10 -	
—	George Duddy -	75 -	10	Rev. William Moore -	30 -	
10	Rogan and Walker -	35 -	11	Conolly M. Lecky -	25 -	
—	James Thompson -	55 -		Widow's-row:		
—	— Hamilton -	20 -		Mrs. Babington -	20 -	
—	William Lennox -	20 -		Mrs. Hawzahaw -	15 -	
—	William Cook -	45 -		Mrs. Christie -	15 -	
—	Mrs. M'Every -	25 -		Mrs. Galbraith -	15 -	
—	Joseph Dismore -	20 -		Mrs. Cochran -	20 -	
—	— Jackson -	20 -				
—	Joseph Dismore -	20 -		Bridge-street:		
—	Marcus M'Laughlin -	25 -	1	Michael Griffin -	10 -	
28	Charles O'Doherty -	30 -		— Phillips -	12 -	
25	Adam Green -	20 -		Moses Steen -	45 -	
—	Miss Cowen -	35 -		Miss Brown -	18 -	
—	Matthew Alexander -	55 -	11	John Graham -	45 -	
—	John M'Dagal -	35 -	12	Mrs. Adams -	20 -	
—	Thomas Steen -	35 -	13	William Logue -	10 -	
—	Hugh Dunlop -	35 -	14	James Devine -	10 -	
—	Robt. & W. Maxwell -	75 -	15	John Bradley -	15 -	

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.
	Bridge-street—cont ^d .	£. s.		Foyle-street:	£. s.
25	James Keenan - - -	12 - -	-	Adam Schoales - - -	35 - -
97	William Gore - - -	15 - -	1	Philip M'Dermott - - -	10 - -
99	James Vance - - -	10 - -	5	William Doherty - - -	10 - -
37	John Downing - - -	20 - -	-	David Mitchell - - -	15 - -
39	John Doherty - - -	16 - -	9	James Vance - - -	10 - -
41	Johnston Smith - - -	16 - -	11	David Miller - - -	10 - -
43	William Sherwood - - -	35 - -	13	Hugh M'Gowan - - -	10 - -
47	William Stewart - - -	10 - -	15	John Quigley - - -	10 - -
48	Mr. Martin - - -	15 - -	17	Adam Schoales - - -	900 - -
50	John Bradley - - -	16 - -	-	B. & H. Darcus - - -	60 - -
51	John Buchanan - - -	10 - -	23	John Sharkey - - -	12 - -
53	John M'Colley - - -	50 - -	-	Martin Connolly - - -	12 - -
56	William Moore - - -	15 - -	-	William Hyndman - - -	12 - -
57	Mrs. Hall - - -	12 - -	-	Daniel Heggarty - - -	12 - -
61	Thomas Doyle - - -	16 - -	-	Samuel Walker - - -	50 - -
63	Mrs. Orr - - -	10 - -	-	John Bond & Co. - - -	70 - -
65	William Moore - - -	10 - -	-	James M'Crea - - -	150 - -
67	Peter M'Donogh - - -	30 - -	-	Tucker - - -	15 - -
-	John Graham - - -	20 - -	-	John Stirling - - -	15 - -
-	James Martin - - -	16 - -	-	John Ferguson - - -	25 - -
-	Hugh Martin - - -	16 - -	-	John Barber - - -	40 - -
-	James M'Cloakey - - -	12 - -	55	David Brogan - - -	10 - -
74	Cardner Boyle - - -	18 - -	-	John Kyle - - -	35 - -
75	Samuel Pegley - - -	18 - -	-	William & John Seathem - - -	220 - -
75	Ezekiel Robinson - - -	15 - -	-	Patrick Gilmour & Co. - - -	130 - -
-	Corporation store - - -	25 - -	-	Charles Stewart - - -	35 - -
-	John O'Flynn - - -	12 - -	62	William Hamerton - - -	20 - -
-	Francis M'Laughlin - - -	10 - -	-	James Jamieson - - -	20 - -
58	— Rodgers - - -	12 - -	-	Charles M'Kinney - - -	25 - -
56	Joseph Scafford - - -	12 - -	-	David Craig - - -	110 - -
50	William Thompson - - -	10 - -	-	John Barber - - -	30 - -
41	Mrs. Crobbie - - -	25 - -	64	Richard Todd - - -	10 - -
43	Mrs. Adams - - -	25 - -	53	Charles M'Callow - - -	10 - -
46	William M'Ginley - - -	10 - -	50	Arnald M'Intyre - - -	18 - -
32	Jerine Carotte - - -	15 - -	48	John Stirling - - -	15 - -
30	William Stirling - - -	15 - -	46	John Ferris - - -	15 - -
22	George M'Comick - - -	18 - -	66	George M'Comick - - -	25 - -
20	— Murray - - -	10 - -	68	Rev. J. Shaw - - -	25 - -
14	John Andrews - - -	15 - -	67	Edward Toy - - -	25 - -
12	— Noble - - -	15 - -	44	Joseph Moore - - -	80 - -
10	John Brigham - - -	60 - -	-	David Moore - - -	30 - -
8	J. Doran - - -	12 - -	-	James M'Comick - - -	20 - -
6	John Adams - - -	25 - -	-	John Macklin - - -	18 - -
4	James Clark - - -	35 - -	-	John Bond - - -	20 - -
2	John Bryson - - -	15 - -	20	John Keeler - - -	16 - -
	Wapping:		-	Thomas Quin - - -	12 - -
-	William Cromie - - -	15 - -	18	Cas Company - - -	150 - -
-	Robert Boreland - - -	10 - -	-	— Ross - - -	10 - -
-	James M'Monemen - - -	25 - -	-	William Eneas - - -	10 - -
54	Patrick Mohan - - -	10 - -	-	John Callahan - - -	10 - -
63	Patrick Campbell - - -	12 - -	-	Mrs. Brown - - -	10 - -
-	William M'Laughlin - - -	12 - -	-	Moses Swan - - -	10 - -
-	Marcus M'Laughlin - - -	10 - -	-	Joseph Proddy - - -	10 - -
40	Charles Henry - - -	10 - -	-	Sugarhouse-lane:	
38	William M'Laughlin - - -	10 - -	-	Hugh Corbett - - -	30 - -
36	Thomas Quin - - -	10 - -	-	James Thompson - - -	30 - -
-	Thomas M'Carter - - -	25 - -	-	East-wall:	
-	Harkin's-lane:		9	Miss Brown - - -	20 - -
-	Patrick Gilmour - - -	100 - -	10	Rev. G. T. Ewing - - -	30 - -
-	James Foster - - -	40 - -	11	Mrs. Boggs - - -	30 - -
16	Thomas Greenlead - - -	16 - -	12	James Beatty - - -	50 - -
12	Miss McLaren - - -	40 - -	-	Market-street:	
10	Monsieur Perois - - -	30 - -	-	Major Winchester - - -	35 - -
16	— Boyle - - -	10 - -	10	Mrs. Robinson - - -	20 - -
-	Mrs. Borch - - -	12 - -	-	Charles O'Doherty - - -	20 - -
4	J. M'Callogh - - -	10 - -	-	Miss Buchanan - - -	15 - -
7	J. M'Idoon - - -	10 - -	-	William Fulton - - -	15 - -

No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.	Appendix (G.)
	Linen Hall-street:	£. s.		East Wall:	£. s.	Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
-	John Allen - - -	35 - -	-	Mrs. Stewart - - -	16 - -	
9	Miss Pie - - -	10 - -	-	Robert M'Intyre - - -	60 - -	
11	James Marshall - - -	60 - -	-	William M'Intyre - - -	45 - -	
-	Sir Robert Ferguson - - -	90 - -	4	Mrs. Curry - - -	45 - -	
13	— Daniel - - -	10 - -	5	Isaac Colhoun - - -	50 - -	
18	Miss Marshall - - -	25 - -	-	Isaac Colhoun - - -	50 - -	
16	Robert M'Carte - - -	25 - -	-	— - - - -	30 - -	
14	John Ferguson - - -	35 - -	-	— M'Dougal - - -	30 - -	
12	William Porter - - -	15 - -	-	Francis Wallen - - -	30 - -	
10	Edward Doherty - - -	10 - -	-	M'Cool & Shannon - - -	10 - -	
8	Philip Smith - - -	15 - -	-			
6	James Dunlop - - -	10 - -	-	Foyle-street:		
4	John Allen - - -	60 - -	-	Daniel Watson - - -	12 - -	
	Ship Quay-street:			Ship Quay:		
-	Cornelius Kyle - - -	35 - -	-	Marcus Stewart - - -	70 - -	
-	James M'Ginley - - -	35 - -	-	Hugh Casey - - -	40 - -	
-	William Scathem - - -	45 - -	-			
-	William Macky - - -	100 - -	-	Foyle-street:		
-	Miss Colonna - - -	45 - -	-	Frizze & Forrest - - -	15 - -	
-	Thomas Freed - - -	50 - -	-	John Nugent - - -	18 - -	
8	William Hastett & Co. - - -	160 - -	-	John Casey - - -	50 - -	
-	Piet Skipson - - -	55 - -	-	Daniel Baird - - -	90 - -	
-	John Barber & Co. - - -	100 - -	-	Archibald M'Corbell - - -	40 - -	
-	William Middleton - - -	90 - -	-	Samuel M'Gowan - - -	90 - -	
-	William Marshall - - -	90 - -	107	George Heggarty - - -	30 - -	
13	John Philson - - -	80 - -	108	Robert Devlin - - -	20 - -	
14	Andrew A. Watt - - -	175 - -	-	Michael M'Feeley - - -	40 - -	
-	John Floyd - - -	75 - -	-	Oliver Bond - - -	50 - -	
-	William S. Smith - - -	100 - -	-	Archibald M'Corbell - - -	35 - -	
-	John Doherty - - -	70 - -	-	Miss Gamble - - -	20 - -	
-	John Nicholson - - -	140 - -	-	Norman M'Leod - - -	10 - -	
-	John Devlin - - -	35 - -	90	Mrs. Orr - - -	50 - -	
-	Alexander Kyle - - -	150 - -	88	Dr. Armstrong - - -	50 - -	
-	Thomas Wallace - - -	125 - -	85	Harvey Nicholson - - -	50 - -	
-	David Brown - - -	90 - -	-	James M'Crea - - -	20 - -	
-	J. W. Johnson - - -	100 - -	-			
94	James Ross - - -	60 - -	-	Terrace:		
-	John Dysart - - -	80 - -	-	John Kelso - - -	60 - -	
26	— Scott - - -	110 - -	-	Adam Schoales - - -	60 - -	
-	Mrs. Boyd - - -	110 - -	-	Dr. Skipton - - -	60 - -	
-	Rev. George Hay - - -	100 - -	-	James M'Crea - - -	60 - -	
-	Dennis Doherty - - -	50 - -	-	Samuel Crookshank - - -	40 - -	
-	Joseph Williams - - -	25 - -	-			
	Richmond-street:			Foyle-street:		
-	Henry M'Dermott - - -	12 - -	-	John Munn - - -	40 - -	
-	Dr. Hamilton - - -	40 - -	-	James M'Crea - - -	120 - -	
-	Mrs. Peoples - - -	35 - -	-	John Lyons - - -	40 - -	
-	Robert Stevenson - - -	35 - -	-	Robert & Wm. M'Intyre - - -	150 - -	
24	Richard Gallaher - - -	20 - -	-	John Munn - - -	250 - -	
-	Dennis Coll - - -	12 - -	-	J. M. Dysart - - -	50 - -	
10	Mrs. Coll - - -	15 - -	-	Thomas Shepherd - - -	45 - -	
18	Edward M'Ginness - - -	10 - -	-	John Munn - - -	60 - -	
16	Rodger M'Dermot - - -	12 - -	96	John Hyndman - - -	50 - -	
14	Miss Curry - - -	30 - -	97	William Dorenpont - - -	85 - -	
12	Dr. White - - -	27 - -	99	John Boyle - - -	55 - -	
10	John Davison - - -	18 - -	101	Francis M'Mullen - - -	15 - -	
8	Miss Stewart - - -	15 - -	-	Thomas Patterson - - -	25 - -	
5	Patrick M'Ginley - - -	15 - -	-			
	Linen Hall-street:			Herring-lane:		
-	Williamson & Christie - - -	75 - -	-	Cladius Chanatic - - -	10 - -	
40	Edward Harkin - - -	12 - -	-	Mrs. M'Colley - - -	10 - -	
-	Michael Ross - - -	15 - -	-	Hugh Casey - - -	18 - -	
-	Robert Ferguson - - -	25 - -	-			
-	Sir Robert Ferguson - - -	90 - -	-	Ship Quay:		
-	George Williamson - - -	30 - -	13	Edward Callahan - - -	20 - -	
-	— Grey - - -	10 - -	17	Mrs. Shannon - - -	30 - -	
-	C. Rogers - - -	10 - -	19	Mrs. Watt - - -	35 - -	
				John Kyle - - -	35 - -	

Appendix (G.)

Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.
	Ship Quay—continued.	£. s.		Strand-street:	£. s.
	Charles Stewart	60		Captain Dall	15
	John McMenamy	15		Unity Free	15
16	Edmund Waddy	15		— Mulligan	18
12	James Mehan	35		Edward Toy	22
	Patrick Mehan	12		Stephen Dobson	22
	Miss Fairly	25		— Crosbie	18
	Frederick Hamilton	25		— M'Cord	15
	James Foster	10		James Doherty	18
	Mrs. M'Colley	70		— Hackett	16
	Patrick Kerr	45		Mrs. M'Laughlin	20
	James Corcoden	50		Sackville-street:	
	John Ferguson	18		Robert M'Intyre	35
	Thomas Cunningham	15		James M'Crea	10
	James Cook	15		James Corcoden	35
	John Bogan	25		Rev. William M'Clure	35
	Fergus M'Conker	15		John Kyle	35
91	Anthony Collins	12		Mrs. Miller	35
	Samuel M'Clintock	45		Pitt Skipton	35
	Charles Bogan	35		Claudius Christie	35
	John A. Smith	250	1	Castle-street:	
	Francis Murphy	10	3	James Preston	80
	William Doherty	45	5	Miss Boyd	15
	Charles Doherty	10		Miss Roulstone	10
	Francis M'Mullen	18	9	Mrs. Montgomery	20
	Robert Allen	45	11	James M'Brade	20
	John Montgomery	15		Miss Conhen	30
	Robert Cunningham	12		Robert Morrison	25
	Thomas Doherty	15		Mrs. Kerr	35
	John Ferguson	12		John Dyssart	90
	Richard Forrest	20		Hugh Corbett	50
	M'Corkell and Foster	100		Robert Allen	25
4	Mrs. M'Conn	10		David Hazleton	25
2	— Phillips	10		John Little	40
	Waterloo-place:		7	Magazine-street:	
1	Christopher Walsh	16		Marcus M'Laughlin	45
2	Captain Britton	18	5	Thomas Greenlead	20
3	Edward Hyslop	20	3	John Doherty	30
4	Adam Greenlead	35		Richard Longlands	35
5	Samuel M'Clintock	100		Joseph Young	40
6	John A. Smith	180		Thomas Havey	110
	Ross T. Smith	80		Marcus Stewart	30
	James Corcoden	15		Diamond:	
	John A. Smith	45	1	William M'Murray	20
	William M'Corkell	90	2	James Pinkerton	25
	George Foster	50	3	William Campbell	40
	Daniel Baird	60	4	Andrew Shannon	25
	Joseph Young	75	4	Matthew Shaw	80
	Miss Pinkerton	30	6	Edward Gilliland	70
	— Chapman	30	7	Charles Morton	70
	Captain Coppin	30		Mrs. Sheils	50
	Captain M'Clintock	30	9	James Smith	60
	Joseph Kelso	30		Andrew Kerr	25
	James M'Crea	45		Marcus Babington	40
	James M'Laughlin	15	12	James M'Colley	45
	James M'Crea	10		Samuel Crookshank	55
	Miss Crompton	10		Mrs. Greer	55
	James Macky	30		Samuel Hyndman	45
	Mrs. Steel	30		Mrs. Wylie	160
	John Murray	30		David Patton	55
	Ernest Leslie	30		John Hunter	55
	Miss Ewing	30		Samuel Smith	100
	Colonel Chetham	40		Mrs. Walker	60
	Henry Darcas	30		John Hill	45
	Thomas P. Kennedy	40		Mrs. Bestie	70
	Hugh Corbett	100		James M'Laughlin	20

No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
	Diamond—continued.	£. s.		Cow-bog—continued.	£. s.	
-	William M'Wade - - -	30 -	-	Edward Collins - - -	15 -	
-	James Thistle - - -	30 -	-	George Doherty - - -	18 -	
-	William M'Arthur - - -	70 -	-	Denis O'Connor - - -	18 -	
-	William M'Arthur - - -	50 -	-	Henry M'Devitt - - -	10 -	
-	William Doherty - - -	12 -	-	William M'Driscoll - - -	10 -	
			-	John M'Cloakley - - -	15 -	
	Bencher-street :			Fahan-street :		
-	James M'Clolland - - -	35 -		James M'Case - - -	10 -	
-	Edward M'Intyre - - -	40 -	1	James Doherty - - -	10 -	
5	Neal M'Lean - - -	40 -	3	James Keen - - -	18 -	
-	Miss Shaw - - -	35 -	5	James Smith - - -	18 -	
-	Robert Cook - - -	45 -	7	Daniel M'Evoy - - -	14 -	
-	David Porter - - -	45 -	9	Patrick Devlin - - -	14 -	
13	Miss Moran - - -	40 -	11	Patrick Barr - - -	15 -	
15	Thomas Doherty - - -	25 -	12	Patrick Doherty - - -	12 -	
-	Samuel Morrison - - -	35 -	-	George Devaney - - -	12 -	
-	James Mehan - - -	500 -	-	Hugh M'Keon - - -	18 -	
-	James Smith - - -	35 -	23	William Gallsber - - -	10 -	
-	David Speer - - -	10 -	37	Daniel M'Laughlin - - -	10 -	
10	William Freal - - -	40 -	39	W. Wilson - - -	10 -	
6	Mrs. Watt - - -	25 -	40	Ann Leman - - -	10 -	
-	Miss Watt - - -	20 -	43	Hugh Pinkerton - - -	10 -	
-	John M'Elveny - - -	16 -	58			
	Cow-bog :			St. Columb's-wells :		
-	Joseph M'Cloakley - - -	12 -	-	Charles Campbell - - -	10 -	
-	Patrick Freal - - -	12 -	-			
-	Hugh Gormley - - -	12 -	-	Fahan-street :		
-	William M'Laughlin - - -	12 -	-	Thomas Cargill - - -	10 -	
-	John M'Donnell - - -	12 -	-	John M'Curran - - -	10 -	
-	Daniel Hill - - -	18 -	35	James Carlin - - -	14 -	
-	Timothy Foy - - -	60 -	20	Charles O'Connor - - -	12 -	
-	Robert Williams - - -	15 -	28	John Higgins - - -	14 -	
-	Christopher Heggarty - - -	20 -	-	John M'Dermott - - -	14 -	
-	Ned Doherty - - -	18 -	-	Daniel Kearney - - -	20 -	
-	William Densy - - -	18 -	-	Charles Tooner - - -	10 -	
-	Robert Mann - - -	12 -	-	Andrew Clarke - - -	10 -	
-	John M'Laughlin - - -	12 -	-			
-	Edward O'Gorman - - -	12 -	-	William-street :		
-	Samuel Robinson - - -	30 -	-	Robert M'Clolland - - -	30 -	
-	John O'Brien - - -	16 -	-	Conningham Wetherow - - -	12 -	
-	James M'Laughlin - - -	10 -	-	Mrs. Devaney - - -	12 -	
-	Patrick Mehan - - -	16 -	-	Edward Gillespie - - -	12 -	
-	John Kenney - - -	12 -	5	Mrs. Doherty - - -	10 -	
-	Daniel Doherty - - -	10 -	-	Patrick Keen - - -	10 -	
26	Bernard M'Feely - - -	12 -	-	William Harland - - -	10 -	
-	Boyd Wiley - - -	14 -	11	James Coyle - - -	10 -	
-	Boyd Wiley - - -	12 -	-	James Cronlish - - -	10 -	
-	John M'Laughlin - - -	10 -	-	John Doherty - - -	10 -	
23	Charles M'Kenney - - -	15 -	17	John Lecky - - -	10 -	
22	Charles Mooney - - -	15 -	19	James M'Cloy - - -	10 -	
21	William M'Dermot - - -	15 -	21	John Cresswell - - -	20 -	
20	Hugh Heggarty - - -	15 -	23	Mrs. Patterson - - -	18 -	
19	John Hetrick - - -	15 -	25	James Kirk - - -	15 -	
18	William Greenstead - - -	35 -	55	Miss Ewing - - -	20 -	
17	Mrs. M'Nott - - -	25 -	53	Captain Cochrane - - -	20 -	
16	John Clark - - -	10 -	65	John Porter - - -	20 -	
-	William Gallsber - - -	14 -	67	Robert Martin - - -	20 -	
-	William Canning - - -	10 -	69	- - -	20 -	
-	Daniel Doherty - - -	18 -	71	James Kerr - - -	20 -	
-	Michael Doohy - - -	14 -	73	William Nimmo - - -	20 -	
-	Mrs. Wilson - - -	14 -	75	Edward Davenport - - -	25 -	
-	Thomas Canning - - -	15 -	77	Mrs. Crookbank - - -	10 -	
-	James Doherty - - -	15 -	79	Robert Harold - - -	12 -	
-	John M'Gready - - -	10 -	81	John M'Nulty - - -	12 -	
-	Daniel Coyle - - -	10 -	83			
-	Patrick Doherty - - -	10 -	85			

Appendix (G.)	No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.
Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.		William-street—cont ^d .	£. s.		Rossville-street:	£. s.
	93	John Brisland - - -	10 -	1	Francis Horner - - -	26 -
	98	Mrs. Preston - - -	18 -	3	Caldwell Bond - - -	10 -
	90	Rev. Henry Mardoock - -	18 -	5	John M'Divitt - - -	10 -
	105	Mrs. Woods - - -	15 -	12	Captain Conn - - -	12 -
	106	Neal Boyle - - -	10 -	-	John Boggs - - -	12 -
	107	Neal Boyle - - -	10 -	-	— Williamson - - -	10 -
	109	Neal Boyle - - -	15 -	21	Mrs. Bradley - - -	10 -
	110	Mrs. Patterson - - -	16 -	23	Mrs. Pinditer - - -	10 -
	111	— Cormack - - -	15 -	25	Richard Langlands - -	10 -
	112	William Barker - - -	15 -	27	Edward Boyle - - -	15 -
	113	Ross T. Smyth - - -	55 -	29	John M'Carte - - -	15 -
	114	Daniel Kenney - - -	10 -	31	— Farley - - -	10 -
		Andrew A. Watt - - -	120 -	33	Tristram M'Grawth - -	10 -
	94	Robert Campbell - - -	20 -	-	Francis Fosyth - - -	15 -
	92	Captain Johnson - - -	20 -	49	Robert Maxwell - - -	10 -
	90	Samuel Barr - - -	10 -	47	John Gilmonr - - -	12 -
	88	John M'Carte - - -	10 -	45	David Gailey - - -	10 -
	86	Smyth & Watt - - -	10 -	43	Andrew Gilmonr - - -	10 -
	80	John Taylor - - -	12 -	41	Captain Wilkinson - -	12 -
		Mrs. Mathewson - - -	10 -	-	David Hannigan - - -	12 -
	76	David Gamble - - -	10 -	-	Captain Webber - - -	15 -
		Robert Causingham - -	12 -	51	Miss Nicholl - - -	10 -
	66	John Sloan - - -	10 -	53	Thomas Reynold - - -	10 -
	64	James Galiber - - -	10 -	55	Mrs. Wilson - - -	10 -
	62	Thomas Beattie - - -	18 -	57	Captain Hughes - - -	10 -
	60	— Hamilton - - -	18 -	59	Franca White - - -	10 -
		Samuel O'Donnell - - -	10 -	71	Patrick Regan - - -	10 -
		Patrick M'Bride - - -	30 -	73	Captain Phillips - - -	12 -
		Patrick M'Bride - - -	18 -	75	Thomas Greenlead - -	10 -
		Hugh Corbett - - -	10 -	77	Leonard Kelly - - -	10 -
		Smyth Osborne - - -	18 -	-		
		William Donohoe - - -	24 -	-	Fahan-street:	
		Miss Coompton - - -	55 -	-	Edward M'Laughlin - -	10 -
		Edward Davenport - -	30 -	74		
	18	Freeman & Edwards - -	10 -	-		
	16	Cathrine M'Corriston - -	10 -	-		
	14	Joseph M'Laughlin - -	15 -	-		
	12	Mrs. Doherty - - -	10 -	-	Rossville-street:	
	10	Patrick Herkin - - -	10 -	-	Michael O'Gorman - - -	10 -
	8	Anthony Collins - - -	20 -	62	William Johnston - - -	10 -
	6	Mark M'Grawth - - -	14 -	-	Mary Green - - -	10 -
		John Creswell - - -	50 -	60	Joseph Wallace - - -	10 -
		John O'Brien - - -	35 -	56	James Close - - -	15 -
					James Close - - -	15 -
				30	Neal Doherty - - -	16 -
		James's-street:			William M'Carra - - -	14 -
	2	D. Ellis - - -	10 -	-	William Harkin - - -	14 -
	4	— Gorman - - -	10 -	-	William Miles - - -	15 -
	6	Samuel Ewing - - -	10 -	-	William Miles - - -	15 -
	8	James Wilson - - -	10 -	-	Hugh Corbett - - -	25 -
	10	James Patterson - - -	10 -	-	Jack Brisland - - -	20 -
		James Pitterson - - -	100 -	-		
		John R. Watt - - -	16 -	-		
		John Creswell - - -	16 -	-		
		Abbey-street:				
	1	Ross T. Smyth - - -	400 -	-	John Kickpatrick - - -	25 -
	3	John Brasslin - - -	10 -	-	James Glenn - - -	10 -
	5	Francis Elliott - - -	10 -	-	Mrs. Alexander - - -	22 -
	7	Robert M'Corkell - - -	10 -	-	Alexander Gwyn - - -	50 -
	9	John Laughlin - - -	10 -	-	Thomas Lindsay - - -	70 -
	11	Joseph Baynham - - -	10 -	-	Miss M'Shane - - -	10 -
	13	William Hunter - - -	10 -	-	Daniel Melholland - -	15 -
	32	James Osborne - - -	20 -	-	Robert Kickpatrick - -	10 -
	24	Samuel Robinson - - -	20 -	-	James M'Bay - - -	10 -
	30	William Seaton - - -	10 -	-	— Young - - -	10 -
	28	John M'Laughlin - - -	10 -	-	Matthew O'Connor - -	10 -
	26	Thomas M'Gwite - - -	10 -	-	George Duddy - - -	10 -
				-	John Owens - - -	10 -
				-	James Mehan - - -	30 -
				-	James Mehan - - -	250 -

No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
	<i>Waterside—continued.</i>	£. s.		<i>Waterside—continued.</i>	£. s.	
-	John Owens - - -	15 -	-	James Cunningham - - -	18 -	
-	Samuel Clarke - - -	45 -	-	Samuel McClure - - -	12 -	
-	Thomas Lindsay - - -	35 -	-	Thomas Allen - - -	10 -	
-	Gwyn & Dunn - - -	35 -	-	James Clark - - -	20 -	
-	Thomas Ballantine - - -	22 -	-	Mrs. Brown - - -	27 -	
-	Joseph Mooney - - -	15 -	-	Robert Dunn - - -	65 -	
-	John Matthewson - - -	10 -	-	John Young - - -	35 -	
-	William Warsock - - -	28 -	-	Andrew Allen - - -	20 -	
-	Samuel Baird - - -	20 -	-	Thomas White - - -	10 -	
-	Thomas White - - -	80 -				

Thomas P. Kennedy, Mayor and Chairman.
Daniel Kearney, Clerk and Collector.

4 April 1837.

NAMES AND RESIDENCES OF THE SEVERAL PERSONS IN THE CITY OF LONDONDERRY, who were returned as subject to Municipal Taxes, and who have been discharged from Payment of Local Rates for the last Year, with the Reasons for which those Persons were so discharged.

<i>Bishop-street:</i>			<i>Society-street:</i>		
James Walker - - -	removed.		Charles M'Shane - - -	removed.	
John Barber - - -	removed.		B. & H. Dorcus - - -	removed.	
John Leatham - - -	removed.		Rev. William Roe - - -	removed.	
John McQuillan - - -	dead.		John McConick - - -	removed.	
Daniel Longan - - -	under 10 l.		Miss Porter - - -	removed.	
John Houston - - -	removed.		James Fisher - - -	dead.	
— M'Caig - - -	removed.		<i>Cuninghams-row:</i>		
Hugh Doherty - - -	removed.		Edward Flannigan - - -	removed.	
John M'Clintock - - -	removed.		Miss Hughes - - -	removed.	
James Boyle - - -	removed.		Miss Rogan - - -	removed.	
— M'Ginley - - -	removed.		John Walsh - - -	removed.	
Patrick Bradley - - -	removed.		Thomas Young - - -	removed.	
William Smyth - - -	removed.		James Corrigan - - -	removed.	
— Johnson - - -	removed.		<i>Long Tower:</i>		
James M'Candless - - -	removed.		Neal O'Donnell - - -	removed.	
Thomas Laughlin - - -	removed.		John Lyons - - -	removed.	
Halliday and Gamble - - -	removed.		M'Ginley & Boyle - - -	waste.	
Joseph Wallace - - -	removed.		Charles Moore - - -	under 10 l.	
Mrs. Greer - - -	removed.		<i>Fountain-street:</i>		
Monsieur Perois - - -	removed.		Rev. James Crawford - - -	removed.	
Miss Elliott - - -	removed.		James Harkin - - -	removed.	
Samuel Mitchel - - -	removed.		George Heggarty - - -	removed.	
George Lude - - -	dead.		W. Robinson - - -	removed.	
John Gill - - -	removed.		— Evans - - -	removed.	
Paul Wylie - - -	dead.		Daniel M'Conick - - -	removed.	
Anthony Donk - - -	removed.		<i>St. Columb's-court:</i>		
<i>Ferry Quay-street:</i>			Miss Pickerton - - -	removed.	
Thomas Collins - - -	removed.		<i>London-street:</i>		
Michael M'Laughlin - - -	removed.		Thomas Patton - - -	removed.	
Miss Seen - - -	removed.		<i>Pump-street:</i>		
Mrs. Mathews - - -	removed.		Thomas Frul - - -	removed.	
Mrs. M'Elroy - - -	removed.		Dr. Rogan - - -	removed.	
Barton Smyth - - -	removed.		Mrs. Beattie - - -	removed.	
Hugh Dunlop - - -	removed.		William O'Doherty - - -	dead.	
Edward M'Ginness - - -	removed.		Edward Doherty - - -	dead.	
Dr. Hamilton - - -	removed.		Patrick Mahan - - -	removed.	
Mrs. Henderson - - -	removed.		William Wallen - - -	removed.	
Miss Fulton - - -	removed.		Frederick Hamilton - - -	removed.	
Henry Ireland - - -	removed.				
John Dennison - - -	dead.				
Robert Smiley - - -	under 10 l.				
William Gray - - -	removed.				

Appendix (G.)
 Names in Towns
 which return
 Members to Par-
 liament.

Artillery-lane :			Richardson-street :	
William Cooke	- -	dead.	Charles Doherty	- - removed.
Wapping :			— Halliday	- - removed.
John Newell	- -	under 10 L.	Bryan Hannigan	- - removed.
Rev. Anthony Carey	- -	removed.	East Wall :	
Hawkin's-lane :			Thomas Stewart	- - dead.
Mrs. Monks	- -	removed.	Rev. Mr. Wade	- - removed.
Miss Lecky	- -	removed.	Norman M'Leod	- - removed.
Bridge-street :			Ship Quay :	
Moses Steen	- -	removed.	Dr. Armstrong	- - removed.
Miss Brown	- -	removed.	Thomas Watt	- - dead.
Sampson Kelly	- -	removed.	William Kearney	- - removed.
William Morrison	- -	removed.	Adam Crompton	- - dead.
Mrs. Adams	- -	removed.	William Tole	- - removed.
Johnston Smyth	- -	removed.	Sergeant M'Callogh	- - removed.
Matthew Shaw	- -	under 10 L.	James Corscaden	- - removed.
Andrew Reid	- -	removed.	George Phillips	- - removed.
Mrs. Brown	- -	removed.	Joseph Moore	- - removed.
Thomas Williams	- -	removed.	Daniel Doherty	- - removed.
R. Richardson	- -	removed.	Waterloo-place :	
John Bradley	- -	removed.	Miss Bradley	- - removed.
J. Faulkner	- -	removed.	Robert Simpson	- - removed.
Plant & Quig :			Joseph Young	- - removed.
— Smyth	- -	removed.	Rev. James Smyth	- - removed.
James Murray	- -	removed.	J. Mitchell Dysart	- - removed.
W. Evans	- -	removed.	Mrs. Schoafes	- - dead.
George M'Cormick	- -	removed.	Adam Crompton	- - dead.
George Dunbar	- -	removed.	Stand-road :	
Michael Doran	- -	removed.	Captain M'Clinock	- - removed.
— Green	- -	removed.	Rev. William M'Clure	- - removed.
Peer Collins	- -	removed.	Francis Hughes	- - removed.
Market-street :			John Montgomery	- - removed.
Mrs. Orr	- -	removed.	Miss Homer	- - removed.
A. Scott	- -	removed.	George Dunbar	- - removed.
Lines Hall-street :			Mrs. Kerr	- - removed.
Robert Bond	- -	removed.	Castle-street :	
William Shannon	- -	removed.	John S. Davison	- - removed.
Edward Doherty	- -	removed.	John Boyd	- - dead.
Frederick Smyth	- -	removed.	Rev. G. T. Ewing	- - removed.
Foyle-street :			— M'Cormick	- - removed.
John Bradley	- -	out of limits.	Magazine-street :	
John M'Caan	- -	removed.	James Conahan	- - dead.
William Wybrants	- -	removed.	Robert Hall	- - removed.
James Duffy	- -	removed.	Thomas Harvey	- - dead.
Daniel M'Dougal	- -	removed.	Butcher-street :	
John Hampson	- -	removed.	Robert M'Intyre	- - dead.
William Doherty	- -	removed.	John Willcock	- - removed.
James M'Daid	- -	removed.	Thomas Rankin	- - removed.
James Henderson	- -	removed.	Cow-Bog :	
Colonel Brown	- -	dead.	John Lynch	- - dead.
Mrs. Lecky	- -	removed.	John M'Divitt	- - removed.
George Lyons	- -	dead.	James Orr	- - removed.
Charles M'Callow	- -	removed.	Robert Williamson	- - removed.
Alexander Bachman	- -	removed.	Fahsa-street :	
Ship Quay-street :			John Doherty	- - removed.
William Colhoun	- -	dead.	James Smyth	- - removed.
John Doherty	- -	removed.	John Lynch	- - removed.
James Corscaden	- -	removed.	William M'Laughlin	- - dead.
Dr. Hare	- -	removed.		
Isaac Colhoun	- -	removed.		
Thomas Davenport	- -	dead.		

St. Columb's-wells:			Abbey-street:			Appendix (G.)
Thomas Campbell	-	removed.	John Mcintosh	-	removed.	Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
William-street:			Joseph Baynham	-	dead.	
Mrs. Keny	-	removed.	Robert Harold	-	removed.	
— Grunshields	-	removed.	Rosville-street:			
Bryan Doherty	-	dead.	Denis Coll	-	removed.	
Philip McLaughlin	-	dead.	William McCasran	-	removed.	
David Gailey	-	removed.	Captain Doll	-	removed.	
— Mulligan	-	removed.	Captain Cochrane	-	removed.	
William Campbell	-	removed.	Robert McGonigle	-	removed.	
John Hyndman	-	removed.	Diamond:			
Fleming Coward	-	dead.	James McCauley	-	removed.	
Mrs. Allen	-	removed.	W. Adams	-	removed.	
Robert Munn	-	removed.	Andrew Kerr	-	removed.	
Rev. Mr. Henderson	-	removed.	William Morrison	-	removed.	
Mrs. Motherell	-	removed.	James Henderson	-	removed.	
Mr. Martin	-	removed.	— Walker	-	removed.	
James Kerr	-	removed.	Thomas Ramsey	-	removed.	
William Brown	-	dead.	Robert Edgar	-	removed.	
Edward Doherty	-	dead.	William Campbell	-	removed.	
John Laughlin	-	removed.				
— M'hibiney	-	removed.				
Robert Hall	-	removed.				
— Robinson	-	removed.				

4 April 1837.

David Kearney, Clerk and Collector.

Thomas P. Kennedy, Mayor.

TOWN OF NEWRY.

No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.
	Hill-street:	£.		Hill-street—continued.	£.
1	Margaret Smith	13	31	Edward Clarke & Co.	55
2			32	John Kearny	45
3	Hugh Small.	—	33	Miss Cwalfield	40
4			34	Unoccupied	75
5	John M'Gowan	16	35	Ditto	30
6	Hugh Small	18	36	Alicia Frazer	42
7	Budget Byrne (nd front).	—	37	Tremble & Kean	55
8	Unoccupied	25	38	Edward Bell	55
9	Ditto	30	39	David Gilis & Co.	45
10	Ditto	16	40	Dr. Connor	40
11	Miss Nesbit	16	41	George Parker	38
12			42	Thomas Pedra	37
13	Nathaniel Weir	36	43	William Blackam	23
14			43½	James Morgan	25
15	Robert M'Cay	35	44	Dr. Gray	27
16	Miss Cozier	35	45	Robert Stewart	50
17	Elizabeth Ingram	35	46	John Morgan	33
18	Isaac Ogle Glenny	50	47	Patrick Courry	20
19	William Cony	40	48	John M'Kee	21
20	Sampel Bailie	45	49	Catherine M'Kittrick	30
21	John Kennedy	43	50	George Blackam	30
21½	Edward Clarke (store)	5	51	Henry Keenan	20
	Ditto - (yard)	5	52	Michael Denver	60
22			53	Surgeon Morrison	68
23	William Howard & Co.	60	54	Jane Osborne	75
24			55	James Moore	63
24½	Thomas Cunningham	40	56	Patrick Doyle	38
25	W. John Davidson	36	57	Thomas Davis	150
26	M. Fagna	40	58	Samuel Bell	45
27	Robert Handcock	30	59	Arbuckle Halyday	50
28	John Briggs	18	60		
29	Anderson & Greens (nd front).	—	61	James T. Halyday	75
30	News-room	50	62		

039.

f f

(continued)

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Town
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Street and Occupant.	Assess Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Assess Value.
Hill-street—continued.			Margaret-street—contd.		
63	John Henry Wallace - -	100.	6	Francis White - - -	20
64	Adam Black - - -	75	7	William Marshall - -	15
65	Mary Copes - - -	18	8	John Hollywood - -	15
66	Alexander Peacock, jun.	97	9	John Shevlin - - -	20
67	Thomas Crolly - - -	15	10	John Small - - -	33
68	Samuel Wallace - - -	55	Mall:		
69	James Williams - - -	55	1	Antony Cavanagh - -	8
69½	John Guy - - -	25	2	Arbuckle Halyday - -	6
70	Telegraph Co. - - -	18	3	Mathew M'Conville - -	8
-	Alexander Peacock - -	25	4	John Kearny - - -	10
71	Peter Murphy - - -	45	5	John M'Keown, jun. - -	10
72	Andrew M'Gowan - - -	16	6	Fair Trader Co. - - -	12
73	Morgan & Stevenson - -	37	7	Peter Seign - - -	7
74	E. & J. Moore - - -	45	8	Under.	
74	Miss Bryden - - -	60	9		
75	Unoccupied - - -	60	10		
76	Pat. M'Parlan - - -	60	11	James Savage - - -	8
77	Captain Seymour - - -	60	12	Maguire & M'Parlan.	-
78	Rev. Dr. Campbell - - -	60	13	Elizabeth Casfield - -	7
79	John Boyd - - -	60	14	George M'Donogh - - -	9
80	James Taylor - - -	8	15	William James - - -	15
81	Robert M'Neil - - -	33	16	Patrick Savage - - -	15
82	Mathew Marley - - -	25	17	John M'Kee - - -	13
84	Thomas Hughes - - -	18	18	John M'Gaw - - -	12
86	Pat. Strackey - - -	25	19	Melting Glenny - - -	7
86	Miss Thompson - - -	16	Kildare-street:		
87	James Wiseman - - -	21	1	James Morgan (sd front).	-
88	John Winters. - - -	-	2	William Flescher - - -	26
89	John Magee. - - -	-	3	Alexander Farrell - - -	20
90	Nathaniel Moore - - -	14	4	Alexander Waddell & Co.	50
91	Peter Marron - - -	6	5	John Quin - - -	100
92	Edward Lyons - - -	30	6	Henry Harden - - -	40
93	Maurice Hungbey - - -	6	Needham-place:		
Marcus-square:			Fields.		
1	Joseph Glenny - - -	60	1		
2	Rev. Dr. Keenan - - -	50	2		
3	Wm. Corry (sd front).	-	3		
4	James Williams (ditto).	-	4		
5	Mrs. Brown - - -	50	5	John Mollan - - -	8
6	Mrs. Black - - -	50	6	James Kennedy - - -	35
7	George Ogle - - -	55	7	Michael Cunningham - -	50
8			8	James Keane - - -	18
Marcus-street:			9	Mrs. Johnston - - -	26
1	Peter Murphy - - -	35	10	Peter Burns - - -	28
2	Mrs. Campbell - - -	12	11	Garden.	-
3	Sam. Barret. - - -	-	12	Mrs. Moore - - -	55
4	Alexander Peacock - - -	5	13	Mrs. O'Beim - - -	50
5	Miss Cunningham - - -	10	14	Dr. Hackett - - -	50
Lower Margaret-street:			15		
1	Rose Ann Torley - - -	10	Kilmorey-street:		
Margaret-square:			1	Catherine Murphy - - -	16
1	Hill Irvine - - -	48	2	John Smith - - -	10
2	William Hamilton - - -	10	3	Andrew Maphet - - -	10
3	Anderson & Greera - - -	90	4	Russell Cope - - -	15
4	Robert Greer - - -	48	5	Unoccupied - - -	10
3	Edw. Case & Co. (sd front).	-	6	Elizabeth Boyd - - -	10
6	Samuel Weir - - -	18	7	Joseph F. Lesson - - -	15
Margaret-street:			8	Denis Marron - - -	18
1	William Patison - - -	21	9	Under.	
2	Clausson & Co. - - -	36	10		
3	James Wilson (sd front).	-	11	Robert Russell - - -	5
4	Henry Magill - - -	25	12	Gillespie - - -	8
5	Robert Burke - - -	30	13	Peter Marron - - -	8
			14	Michael Boyle - - -	8
			15	Bernard M'Garry - - -	11

No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
16	Kilmorey-street—cont ^d .	£.		Lower Water-st.—cont ^d .	£.	
17	George Ferguson - - -	11	4	Under.	—	
18	Under.	—	5			
19			6			
20			7	High Campbell - - -	9	
21			8	Michael Byrne - - -	9	
22	Claudius Burn - - -	14	9	Philip Meehan - - -	6	
23	James Taylor - - -	13	10	Rodger Groan - - -	8	
24	Henry Oxhorough - - -	12	11	John Miller - - -	6	
25	Under.	—	12			
26			13	Under.	—	
27	Stephen Morgan.	—	14			
28	Arthur Magenis - - -	5	15	John Nicholson - - -	5	
29	Under.	—	16	William Magian - - -	6	
30	William N. Thompson - - -	70	17	Patrick Ruddle - - -	6	
31	—	—	18	Unoccupied - - -	5	
32			19	Samuel Norrit - - -	5	
33	Gas works - - -	35	20	John Kane - - -	6	
34			21	David Chambers - - -	6	
35	John Milling - - -	5	22	Charles Lawson - - -	8	
36	Patrick Magee - - -	10	23	Mary Mathers - - -	5	
37	Unoccupied - - -	—	24	Patrick Burke - - -	10	
38	Aimor Boyle - - -	25	25	James Heathwood - - -	7	
39	John Dempsey (sd front).	—	26	Thomas King - - -	8	
40	Agnes Quin - - -	5	27	James Russell - - -	7	
41	John Congrove - - -	10	28	Rodger Maguire - - -	7	
42	Martin Phelan - - -	10	29	Unoccupied - - -	7	
43	Mrs. Smith - - -	12	30	Rodger Maguire - - -	7	
44	Unoccupied - - -	—	31	Under.	—	
45	Patrick Molloy - - -	12	32	Rodger Maguire - - -	7	
46	Lawford Tronson - - -	14	33	William Fairfield - - -	5	
47	Thomas Clarke - - -	14	34	John Reilly - - -	6	
48	Rowland Savage - - -	5	35	John M'Namara - - -	5	
49	Under.	—	36	Patrick Hanlon - - -	5	
50			37			
51	Lying-in Hospital - - -	8	38	Charles Jennings - - -	12	
52	Under.	—	39	Ditto - - -	5	
53	Thomas T. Duff - - -	12	40			
54	John Hill - - -	12	41			
55	Laurence Ryan - - -	5	42			
56	Under.	—	43			
57			44			
58	Unoccupied - - -	9	45			
59	James Wilson - - -	8	46			
60	Unoccupied - - -	8	47			
61	Frederick Bridgtower - - -	8	48			
62			49			
63			50			
	St. Mary-street:		51			
1	Unoccupied - - -	6	52			
2	Richard Harris - - -	10	53			
	River-street:		54			
1	Peter Burns - - -	5	55			
2	Under.	—	56			
3			57			
4	Thomas Morrison - - -	5	58			
5	Under.	—	59			
6			60			
7			61			
8			62			
9	James Bradford - - -	21	63			
	Lower Water-street:					
1	Archibald Little - - -	5				
2	John Rice - - -	5				
3	Thomas Magenis - - -	5				

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.
Water-street—continued.			Market-square—contd.		
24	Catherine M'Mahon - - -	5	5	Under.	—
25	Richard Bloxam - - -	5	6		
26			14		
27	Under.	—	15	John Marshall - - -	8
28			16	Miss Brodie - - -	8
29	William Clarke - - -	14	17	Thomas Laing & Co. - - -	12
30	James G. Quin - - -	85	18	John Goodin - - -	8
31			19	Thomas M'Parlan - - -	7
32	Hugh Campbell - - -	12			
33	James Mallon - - -	15	North-street:		
34			1	Unoccupied - - -	20
35	John Finch - - -	14	2	Margaret Conolly - - -	20
36	Sarah Quin - - -	22	3	George Kelly - - -	24
37	James Buckley - - -	11	4		
38	James Black - - -	23	5	Henry Savage - - -	30
39	Henry Wright - - -	23	6	John Fowler - - -	20
40	David Scott - - -	50	7	Charles Connolly - - -	20
41	John Kidd - - -	46	8	Thomas Mugnis - - -	40
42			9	Arthur Collins - - -	25
43	Richard Griffin.	—	10	Surgeon Waddle - - -	21
44	Robert Glenny - - -	20	11	Andrew Jennings - - -	52
45	John Collins - - -	26	12	Christopher Ross - - -	28
46	Bernard M'Carty - - -	18	13	William Duncan - - -	31
47	Edward Ferris - - -	46	14	Patrick Sheeran - - -	13
48	Isaac Davidson - - -	32	15	James M'Guinness - - -	16
49	Rowan M'Naghtin - - -	65	16	Wm. and James Creek - - -	57
50	Hill Irvine - - -	35	17	James M'Alenden - - -	32
51	George Rogers - - -	15	18	Patrick Haughey - - -	26
52	James Heathwood - - -	26	19		
53	James Wilson - - -	70	20	Mrs. Aderly - - -	33
Market-street:			21	Patrick Torley - - -	48
1	James Yuden - - -	32	22	Richard Liddy - - -	45
2	Dennis D'Amignn - - -	30	23	James Savage - - -	50
3	Owen Tegar - - -	13	24	William Cowan - - -	30
4	William Fegan - - -	22	25	Alexander Canning - - -	43
5	Bernard Madden - - -	18	26	Thomas King - - -	38
6	Stephen Mallon - - -	10	27	Edward Reilly - - -	42
7	Edw. M'Carty - - -	17	28	James M'Kenna - - -	31
8	John Simpson - - -	21	29	Thomas M'Kenna - - -	42
9	Margaret Cowan - - -	22	30	William Dunann - - -	17
10	James Ferguson - - -	27	31	Mrs. Templeton - - -	15
11	James Grant - - -	25		Francis White - - -	5
12	Peter Brett - - -	15	32	William M'Guffin - - -	15
13			33	Unoccupied - - -	32
14	John O'Hagan & Son - - -	80	34	Edmond Quin - - -	45
15			35	John Power - - -	20
16	Pat. C. Byrne - - -	60	36	Catherine Clarke - - -	13
17	John Molan - - -	46	37	Patrick Dowdall - - -	25
18	David Kennedy - - -	35	38	Catherine Blaney - - -	18
19	John Kelly - - -	35	39	John Todd - - -	26
20	Unoccupied - - -	14	40	John M'Guffin - - -	17
21	Michael Hamilton - - -	35	41	Jane Neil - - -	24
22	Mary Ann O'Hagan - - -	40	42	James Pattison - - -	22
23	George Scott - - -	49	43	Thomas M'Kenna - - -	30
24	Unoccupied - - -	34	44	William Walker - - -	27
25	Henry Harpet - - -	23	45	Ann Laing - - -	18
26	Patrick Boyle - - -	26	46	Unoccupied - - -	18
27	Unoccupied - - -	12	47	Doito - - -	14
28	Mrs. Rice - - -	45	48	John White - - -	35
Market-square:			49	Surgeon Fitzpatrick - - -	40
1	James M'Dooll - - -	7	50	Samuel Anderson - - -	25
2	Thomas Doran. - - -	—	51	Francis M'Cann - - -	42
3	Owen Mallon - - -	8	52	James Boyd - - -	18
4	Doito - - -	8	53	William Minter - - -	27
			54	Robert Hamilton - - -	26
			55	Michael Carr - - -	16

No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.
	Black's-court :	£.		Lower North-street—cont^d.	£.
1	Grace Quin - - -	5	58	Terence Conolly.	—
2	Arthur Muldoon - - -	5	59	John Thomas Foster - - -	8
	Power's-entry :		60	Bernard M'Donnell - - -	9
10	Small houses.	—	61	Margaret Neeson - - -	9
5			62	Thomas Boyd - - -	18
6	Set to lodgers - - -	5	63	Mathew Maginnis - - -	10
	Lower North-street :			Lindsay's-hill :	
1	Thomas Finlay - - -	13	1	David Henney - - -	5
2	Edward O'Harkin - - -	30	2	John Quin - - -	6
3	Patrick Grant - - -	24	3	Richard Marshall - - -	6
4	George Quin - - -	34	4	Coranne M'Parlan - - -	5
5	Patrick Maguire - - -	23	5	Frederick Parker - - -	5
6	Unoccupied - - -	28	6	George Anderson - - -	5
7	Under.	—	7	Small houses, under.	—
8	William Mollan - - -	10	10		
9	William M'Night - - -	20	11	John Smith - - -	5
10	James Hutton - - -	22		Trevor-hill :	
11	James Maguire - - -	5	1	Samuel Parsons - - -	70
12	Unoccupied - - -	5	2	Mrs. Thompson - - -	85
13	Agnes Rafferty - - -	14	3		
14	Mary M'Manus, under.	—	4	Thomas Waring - - -	90
15	John Anderson - - -	9	5		
16	Charles M'Carthy - - -	8	6	William Fletcher - - -	45
17	John M'Night - - -	12	7	John Quin - - -	50
18	Margaret Malley - - -	8	8	Samuel Fraser - - -	49
19	James Maguire - - -	8	9	Captain M'Russell - - -	42
20	James M'Gowan - - -	9	10	Mrs. Melting - - -	45
21	James M'Gowan - - -	8	11	Dr. Woods - - -	50
22	Elizabeth Courtney - - -	8	12		
23	William Menight - - -	8	13	Archibald Little - - -	110
24	Thomas Weir - - -	—	14		
25	Nicholas Thompson - - -	6	15	James Hill - - -	—
26	John Fox - - -	18	16	James Lyle - - -	38
27	John Smith - - -	18	17	James Hill - - -	11
28	George M'Gowan - - -	18	18	Mrs. Maxwell - - -	20
29	James Fegan - - -	6	19	Mrs. Stephens - - -	20
30	Margaret M'Camley - - -	30		Downshire-road :	
31	William Doyle - - -	38		Wm. Fletcher, field - - -	6
32	Charles Quin - - -	42		Edward Clark, garden - - -	5
33	William Gordon - - -	8		Robert Henry Ashe - - -	52
34	Richard Bloxham - - -	14		Rev. E. T. Moffet - - -	40
35	Patrick Rogan - - -	10		Rev. John Weir - - -	48
36	Arthur Shields - - -	10		Lieut.-Col. Hamilton - - -	52
37	Samuel Robison - - -	10		John Richey - - -	14
38	John Keen - - -	10		John Thomas Duff - - -	14
39	John O'Hagan - - -	10		— Brabson - - -	14
40	James Boyd - - -	10		Robert Hamilton - - -	48
41	Rose Campbell - - -	8		John Quin - - -	48
42	John Costigan - - -	10		George Ogle Godfrey - - -	66
43	Francis O'Neill - - -	10		Isaac Glenny - - -	40
44	Unoccupied - - -	10		Rowan M'Naghin, garden - - -	5
45	James Fee - - -	10		Rev. John Kerr - - -	14
46	Samuel M'Donnell - - -	13		John Corbest - - -	48
47	Hugh Christalm - - -	9		James Waring - - -	95
48	Michael O'Donnell - - -	14		Archibald Little, garden - - -	5
49	Patrick Elliot - - -	15		William Forrest - - -	45
50	John M'Court - - -	12		Pierce Murphy - - -	12
51	George Kelly - - -	9		Felix O'Hear - - -	7
52	Bridget Madden - - -	10			
53	Joseph Glenny - - -	9			
54	James Maguire - - -	12			
55	William Quin - - -	10			
56	James Thompson - - -	29			
57	Bernard M'Donnell - - -	25			

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.
	Sandy's-street :	£.		Mill-street—continued.	£.
1	Catherine Finzer - - -	7	7	Patrick Callahan - - -	5
2	John M'Connick - - -	7	8	Hugh Marney - - -	10
3	Jane Rigby - - -	7	9	Ridget Roddy - - -	6
4	Thomas Keogh - - -	5	10	Hugh Kidd - - -	200
5	Under.	—	11	Francis Jennings - - -	24
6	Rev. Noble Sheppard - - -	16	12	Unoccupied - - -	6
7	William Ruddle - - -	14	13	Ditto - - -	6
8	Thomas Rowan - - -	15	14	Arthur O'Hagan - - -	7
9	John Briggs - - -	15	15	James Irvine - - -	18
10	Unoccupied - - -	14	16	Unoccupied - - -	10
11	Rev. F. Armstrong - - -	14	17	Unoccupied - - -	18
12	Edward Addy - - -	14	18	Joseph Grandy - - -	18
13	Mrs. Minnie - - -	11	19	Dominick Sharkey - - -	18
14	John Ewart - - -	10	20	Thomas Henry - - -	18
15	Stewart Dabzell - - -	9	21	Peta M'Kenna - - -	10
16	Anne Connolly - - -	9	22	Bernard Keenan - - -	10
17			23	Francis Cosgrove - - -	8
	Talbot-street :		24	James M'Kenna - - -	30
1	Nicholas Cunningham - - -	9	25	Mrs. Fegan - - -	14
2	Walter Horton - - -	9	26	Henry Grant - - -	38
3	Alexander Hill - - -	9	27	Charles Murphy - - -	25
4	Arthur Graham - - -	9	28	Edward H. Courtney - - -	40
5	Unoccupied - - -	9	29	Elizabeth Grant - - -	21
6	Ditto - - -	9	30	Joseph Caldwell - - -	14
7	James Thompson - - -	10	31	Unoccupied - - -	14
8	Mrs. Brooks - - -	10	32	Robert Lundy - - -	15
9	James O'Neill - - -	10	33	Unoccupied - - -	13
10	James Moss - - -	10	34	Bernard Calley - - -	13
10½	Unoccupied - - -	5	35	Patrick Shurkey (2d front) - - -	—
11	John Fowler, jun. - - -	9	36	Bridget Byrne - - -	22
12	John Fowler, sen. - - -	15	37	Unoccupied - - -	10
13	Unoccupied - - -	8	38	James O'Brien - - -	10
14			39	Thos. M'Laughlin - - -	25
15	Under.	—	40	Mathew Coulon - - -	10
16	Unoccupied - - -	9	41	Felix Fegan - - -	10
17	Ditto - - -	9	42	Anne Donnelly - - -	9
18	Richard Magowan - - -	7	43	Thomas Magee - - -	7
19	William Weiz - - -	7	44	Edward M'Gay - - -	7
20	Unoccupied - - -	7	45	John O'Neill - - -	16
21	Patrick Carr - - -	6	46	Thos. Gibson Henry - - -	50
22	Mrs. Fitzpatrick - - -	6	47	Ditto - - -	8
23	Jane M'Calpin - - -	17	48	James M'Keown - - -	14
	Windsor-hill :		49	Patrick Books - - -	12
1	Mrs. Langtry - - -	12	50	Michael Mallen - - -	10
	Postley-place :		51	James Turner - - -	9
	Alexander Postley - - -	40	52	James Morgan - - -	8
	Arthur-street :		53	Margaret Brown - - -	12
1	Joseph Fowler - - -	5	54	Patrick Murphy - - -	12
2	John Fowler - - -	5	55	Bernard M'Kerrett - - -	10
3	Henry Bell - - -	5	56	Daniel Espie - - -	16
	Mill-street :		57	Margaret Cunningham - - -	21
1	Dominick Daly - - -	38	58	Unoccupied - - -	21
2	Charles Jennings - - -	38		Mill-lane :	
3	James Fenigan - - -	42	1	Michael Toner - - -	5
4	William Logan - - -	20	2	George Campbell - - -	5
5	Mathew Faingan - - -	8	3	Owen Finzor - - -	5
6	John Dunn - - -	15		George's-lane :	
			1	Daniel Hollywood - - -	8
			2	Henry Grant - - -	7

No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
	Castle-street :	£.		Hide-market—continued.	£.	
1	Michael Dowry - - -	30	5	Francis Hughes - - -	9	
2	Patrick Pullen - - -	18	6	Ditto - - - - -	5	
3	Mary Downy - - -	15	7	Michael Mallen - - -	6	
4	Patrick M'Namer - - -	13	8	Small houses.	—	
5	James M'Gurgan - - -	12	9	Miles Russell - - -	5	
6	Catherine M'Alindon - - -	15	10	Small houses.	—	
7	Robert Atkison - - -	16	11			
8	Patrick M'Mallen - - -	20	12			
9	Henry Collins - - -	32	13			
10	Robert Dowdall - - -	20	14	Michael Marron - - -	9	
11	Hugh Quin - - -	18	15			
12	Felix M'Gee - - -	15		Castle-place :		
13	Margaret Connolly - - -	10	1	John Beady - - -	10	
14	James Lowry - - -	20	2	Joseph Barber - - -	32	
15	Thomas Polin - - -	22		William-street :		
16	Dennis Beasigan - - -	32	1	Patrick White - - -	5	
17	Bernard Hughes - - -	13	2	Andrew Troy, under.	—	
18	Domnick Magee - - -	5	3	John Coffey - - -	8	
19	Meal-market-house - - -	10	4	Ruins.	—	
20	Unoccupied - - -	12	5	Unoccupied - - -	20	
21	John L. Flanigan - - -	8	6	David Hynes, under.	—	
22	Small houses.	—	7	Pierce Murphy - - -	15	
23	James Scouglt - - -	27	8	Arthur Boyle - - -	22	
24	John Doyle - - -	14	9	Thomas Turner - - -	25	
25	Eileen Burke - - -	14	10	Michael Smith - - -	15	
26	James Wardlow - - -	17	11	Thomas M'Namer - - -	15	
27	Bernard Coleman - - -	18	12	Catherine Murphy (sd front).	—	
28	Bryan O'Hare - - -	7	13	John L. Flanigan - - -	30	
29	James Crawford - - -	13	14	John Green - - -	7	
30	Felix Campbell - - -	15	15	Unoccupied - - -	10	
31	Unoccupied - - -	9	16	Ditto - - -	11	
32	Ditto - - -	12	17	Francis Keane - - -	21	
33	John Kenihan - - -	20	18	William M'Grath - - -	12	
34	Trevor Corry - - -	20	19	Rev. Daniel M'Affee - - -	9	
35	Ann Douglas - - -	10	20	Thomas Boyd - - -	7	
36	John M'Givra - - -	12	21	Peter Cosgrove - - -	8	
37	Owen M'Alcer - - -	12	22	Michael Cosgrove - - -	7	
38	Patrick Fern - - -	14	23	Edward Cosgrove - - -	7	
39	John Morgan - - -	14	24	Richard Hynes - - -	7	
40	Thomas M'Donnell - - -	16	25	John M'Adam - - -	8	
41	Shambles - - -	8	26	Bernard Rice - - -	6	
42	Michael Magee - - -	12	27			
43	Stephen Crossmy, under.	—	28			
44	Daniel Dorn - - -	8	29	Abbey-yard :		
45	Mary Magan, under.	—		Edward M'Connell - - -	9	
46	Henry M'Camby - - -	32	1	Francis M'Connell - - -	9	
47	Hugh Rooney - - -	14	2	Small houses.	—	
48	Thomas Hollywood - - -	18	3	Captain Waters - - -	18	
49	Isaac William Glenay - - -	40	4	Small houses.	—	
50	Richard Culley - - -	30	5			
51	Ann Downey - - -	40	6	Small houses.	—	
52	Francis Andrews - - -	12	7	Potato-market-house - - -	10	
53	James M'Kinley - - -	11	8	Mrs. Carlsle - - -	35	
54	Thomas M'Grath - - -	9	9	Dr. Burden - - -	40	
55	Neal Conolly - - -	9	10	Miss Corry - - -	50	
56	John Fern - - -	22	11			
57	Unoccupied - - -	17	12	Courtney-hill :		
58	Elizabeth M'Camby - - -	22	13	Patrick Callan - - -	42	
59	Michael Downy - - -	48	1	Charles O'Hagan - - -	50	
60			2	Under.	—	
61	Hide-market :		3	Ditto.	—	
62	Patrick M'Cormick - - -	12	4	Unoccupied - - -	30	
63	Michael Lennaghan - - -	5	5			
64	Michael Burns - - -	5	6			
65	Thomas Connolly - - -	5	6			

Appendix (G.)

Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	
	Bont-street :	£.		Chapel-street—continued.	£.	
1	Laurence Ryan - - -	18	7	James Mulligan - - -	6	
2	John Keenan - - -	7	8			
3	Peter Crauford - - -	8	10	Under (small houses).	—	
4	Thomas Quin - - -	11	19			
5	Elizabeth Whitaker - - -	16	20	Patrick M'Gowan - - -	6	
6	James Magee - - -	9	21	Hugh Campbell - - -	6	
7	John Mulligan, under.	—	22	John Byden - - -	5	
8	Richard Blackburn - - -	14	23			
9	Unoccupied - - -	14	10	Under.	—	
10	Ditto, under.	—	30			
11	James Brodie - - -	8	31			
12	William M'Laughlin, under.	—	10	Beyond police limits.	—	
13	Unoccupied - - -	15	82			
14	Miss M'Grane - - -	15	83	Isabella M'Gowan - - -	7	
15	Owen Prusty - - -	5	84	Under (small houses).	—	
16			85	Ditto - (ditto).	—	
17	Michael Callan - - -	30	86	Hans Baird - - -	7	
18	Richard Whitehead - - -	20	87			
19	Elizabeth Corry - - -	6	10	Under.	—	
20	Rodger Morrison - - -	5	90			
21	Thomas M'Comish - - -	7	91	William M'Analty - - -	10	
22	William Brighton - - -	7	92	Terence Loughran - - -	6	
23	Unoccupied - - -	20	93	Samuel Brown - - -	5	
24	Michael Callan.	—	94	Hugh M'Kendrick - - -	9	
25	Edward Flanigan - - -	11	95			
26	Joseph Hening.	—	96	Under (small houses).	—	
27	Unoccupied - - -	8	97	Police barracks - - -	12	
28	Ditto - - -	8	98	Under (small houses).	—	
29	James Ferguson - - -	6	99	Christopher M'Levy - - -	8	
30	John Henry - - -	35				
31	Michael Adrain - - -	27		Baidewell-row :		
32	Thomas M'Kay - - -	6		Edward Quin - - -	5	
33	John Burns - - -	5				
34	Stephen Burns - - -	8		High-street :		
35	Under.	—		1	John Carroll - - -	22
36	Samuel Fegan - - -	10		2	Ann Fegan - - -	18
37	Under.	—		3	William Thompson - - -	26
38				4	Bernard M'Mahon - - -	10
39	Terece M'Parlan.	—		5	Unoccupied - - -	10
40	Sarah M'Mahon - - -	5		6	John Davidson - - -	25
41	Hugh Keenan - - -	5		7	Michael Hooks - - -	30
42	William Brown - - -	8		8	Mrs. Murdock - - -	22
43	Anthony Gosan - - -	10		9	Henry Turley - - -	7
44	Hugh Turley - - -	5		10	Michael Lynn - - -	6
45	Edward Weir - - -	5		11	Michael Hooks - - -	12
46	Mrs. Pinks - - -	20		12	John Stewart - - -	6
47	Miss Atkinson - - -	10		13	Isaac Brown - - -	7
48	William Flanigan - - -	5		14	John Mercer.	—
49	Patrick Marron, under.	—		15	Jane Acken - - -	6
50	Patrick Fegan - - -	7		16	Jane Gushan.	—
51	Unoccupied - - -	6		17	John Stewart - - -	12
52	Patrick Murphy - - -	6		18	James Ledlee - - -	26
53	Henry Spotswood - - -	6		19	Alexander A. Clarke - - -	10
				20	Thomas Henry - - -	15
	Quay-street :			21	John Boyd - - -	5
1	Thomas Kane - - -	5		22	Unoccupied - - -	5
2	Patrick Rooney - - -	5		23	James Kernahan - - -	5
3	John Fegan - - -	5		24	David Farvell - - -	8
4	John Heamey - - -	5		25	William Boyd - - -	7
5	Unoccupied, under.	—		26	John Hill - - -	7
6	John Deapsy - - -	10		27	Unoccupied - - -	6
				28	James Flanigan - - -	5
	Chapel-street :			29	Robert Campbell - - -	5
1	Patrick O'Hare - - -	10		30	Bernard Cullen - - -	5
2	Pat Shaughnessy - - -	7		31	Andrew Gillespie - - -	5
3	Hugh Hagan - - -	5		32	Ann Clements - - -	7
4	Paul Byrne - - -	5		33	Samuel Jordan - - -	7
5				34		
6	Under (small houses).	—		35		

No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
	High-street—continued.	£.		Sugar Island—continued.	£.	
69	Unoccupied	8	17	Joseph Mitchell	26	
70	James Horton	10	18	— Marshall	42	
72	Henry Magill	16	19	Unoccupied	16	
73	Walter Weir	5	20	Peter West	22	
74	Thomas Clarke	6	21	George Griffin	32	
76	Samuel Robinson	6	22	Robert M'Mina	45	
77	Viola Dunn	5	23	John Thompson	5	
78	Patrick Traynor	5	24	Thomas M'Crath	10	
81	Terence O'Hear	7				
90	Richard Hancock	12		Salt-yard:		
91	John Dodd	6	1	Mary Thompson	6	
104	Bernard Bennett	6	5	Daniel M'Kee	9	
105	Patrick Fegan	6	6	Ditto.	—	
107	William Thompson	5	7	Bernard Murtagh	5	
108	Robert Irwin	5	8	Hugh Dalzell	70	
111	Joseph Edgar	7				
114	Thomas M'Conville	6		Sugar-house Quay:		
119	Thomas Handcock	7	2	John Richey	35	
121	David Lockart	12	3	Conys, Little & Serrazy	55	
122	David M'Call	6	4	Mrs. Wilson	12	
123	William Lockart	6	5	Surgeon Woods	40	
124	James Pix	5	6	John Quin	25	
125	James Smyth	5				
126	John Ellis	22		Basin-quay:		
127	David Boyd	8	1	John M'Kee	12	
128	James Lamb	6	2	Andrew Jennings	7	
129	Michael Branigan	6	3	Ditto	12	
131	Marmaduke Judge	6	4	David Heron	12	
133	Alexander Henry	5				
134	Francis Ferns	7	4	Basin:		
136	William Murphy	7	7	Francis Carville	8	
137	Sarah Ratcliff	9	7	Unoccupied	28	
138	Thomas Graham	9	8	Robert Purden	23	
141	Patrick Torley	9	9	Captain Twigge	25	
142	Rachel Craig	10	10	Unoccupied	12	
143	Charles Morgan	12				
144	Elizabeth Johnstone	8	1	Basin-walk:		
145	Owen Fegan	18	2	John Best	7	
147	Thomas Carr	26	3	Miss Hughes	8	
148	James Ryan	16	3	Miss Norwood	16	
149			4	John Hunter	17	
			5	Mrs. Parker	23	
			6	Joseph M'Minn	21	
	Pollock's-court:					
1	John Davidson	6		Barack-lane:		
2	Police Commissioners	6	2	David Scott	6	
			3	Redmond Jennings	5	
			7	Mrs. M'Camley	10	
	Walker's-court:					
1	Archibald Campbell	18		Canal-quay:		
2	Hugh Kelly	7	1	Joseph Elliot	8	
			2	Redmond Jennings	15	
	Sugar Island:		3	John J. Carter	25	
1	Hugh C. Baetz	17	4	Newry Navigation Company	25	
2	Lewis Judge	21	5	John Moore	60	
3	Elizabeth Annet	11	6	Unoccupied	60	
4	W. Buchanan	15	7	John Richey	35	
5	John Best	27	8	William Handcock	10	
6	Surgeon Davis	22		Isaac Smith	12	
7	Margaret M'Linn	22	9	Rowan M'Naghlin	12	
8	Hugh Dalzell	105		Ditto	10	
9	Francis Carville	105		James Spence	16	
10	Adams Liddle	35	11	Andrew Jennings	14	
11	William Handcock	75	12	Benjamin Thompson	20	
12	John Richey	40	13	Unoccupied	20	
13	Unoccupied	20	14	Joseph Nicholson	10	
14	James Clarke	10	15	Elizabeth Quin	45	
15	Surgeon Woods	25	16	Samuel A. Bell & Co.	13	
16	William Miller	14	17			

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.
	Canal-quay—continued.	£.		Canal-street—continued.	£.
18	Alexander Macdonnell - - -	42	6	Joseph Marshall - - -	15
19	John Richey - - -	10	7	William Lockart - - -	24
20	Conys, Little & Smyrny - - -	47	8	James Lawless - - -	20
			9	Walser Hall - - -	8
	Merchant's-quay :		9½	Owen & James Ferris - - -	9
1	Eliza M'Court (sd front). - - -	—	10	Henry Burns - - -	9
2	John M'Gay - - -	10	11	James Moore - - -	8
3	William M'Case - - -	18	12	John M'Kenna - - -	5
4	Francis Lawson - - -	18	13	James Spence - - -	14
5	Newry Navigation Co. - - -	10	14	Anne Ledlie - - -	28
6	Matthew Russell - - -	18	15	Bridget Walsh - - -	6
6½	Robert Clarke - - -	14	16	Jane Benn - - -	7
7	John Reid - - -	90	17	John Haffey - - -	8
8	Unoccupied - - -	38	18	George Conroy - - -	8
9	John M'Genth - - -	5	28	Arbuckle Halyday - - -	5
10	Edward Byrne - - -	14	29	Mrs. Atkins - - -	24
11	James G. Quin - - -	56	30	Mrs. Mortimer - - -	16
12	Robert Purden - - -	48	31	Mrs. Newell - - -	16
13	Maguire & M'Parlan - - -	70	32	Frances Oyle - - -	36
14	Dennis Maguire - - -	70	33	Samuel Ledlie - - -	36
-	John Thompson Carter - - -	44	34	William A. Hunt - - -	17
15	Elizabetha Quin - - -	—	35	Joseph Henning - - -	10
16	John Rogan - - -	23	36	Samuel Murdock - - -	11
17	John Carraker - - -	95	37	Peter Duffy - - -	6
18	John Donnelly - - -	50	40	John Bowman - - -	5
19	Isaac Cony Reid - - -	38	42	John Mollan - - -	5
20	John & Hugh Boyd - - -	30	43	James M'Grath - - -	8
22	Unoccupied - - -	40	44	Richard M'Grath - - -	8
23	James M'Mahon - - -	30	45	Unoccupied - - -	23
24	Isaac Wm. Glenn & Sons - - -	75	61	Captain Mason - - -	20
26	James M'Clendhan - - -	69	52	Samuel Freeburn - - -	5
26	Godfrey & Johnston - - -	150	53	William Kelly - - -	6
27	Charles Jennings - - -	85	54	Jane Little - - -	6
28	James & Joseph Lyle - - -	46	55	John Donnelly - - -	20
-	William Mansley - - -	36	56	Thomas Lowry - - -	14
29	Robert M'Cracken - - -	40	57	Charles Walkin - - -	13
30	James & Joseph Lyle - - -	75	58	Michael Walsh - - -	18
31	Ditto - - -	6	59	John M'Loughlin - - -	12
32	Samuel Ledlie & Co. - - -	6	60	Robert M'Evoy - - -	12
33	Ditto - - -	40	61	Thomas Little - - -	14
34	William Walmsley - - -	65	62	James M'Cudden - - -	8
35	John & Hugh Boyd - - -	10	67	Joseph Malone - - -	8
36	George Guy - - -	75	68	Thomas Ingle - - -	8
37	James Hamill - - -	30	69	Robert Nickle - - -	8
38	John Cummins - - -	45	70	— Bailec - - -	17
39	Hugh Moore - - -	20	75	Samuel Reid - - -	50
40	Patrick M'Camley - - -	22	76	James Patterson - - -	9
41	Henry Blackam - - -	6	78	Mrs. M'Callough - - -	11
42	John Nesbit - - -	6	79	Arthur Kelly - - -	12
44	Robert Quin - - -	40	81	Patrick Fegan - - -	6
			82	Simon M'Clendhan - - -	6
	Batter Crane-quay :		83	Bernard Magenis - - -	5
2	John Melling - - -	7	84	David Hunter - - -	5
3	King's bonding-yard - - -	20	85	Michael Fair - - -	6
4	Samuel Boyd - - -	26	86	Arthur O'Hear - - -	7
5	Ditto - - -	120	87	Robert Kirk - - -	15
6	Unoccupied - - -	16	88	Miss Jefferson - - -	12
			89	Miss Salmon - - -	14
	Ballybot-bridge :		90	Mrs. Crawford - - -	16
-	James Keen - - -	14	91	Miss Moore - - -	35
			96	John Reid - - -	5
	Canal-street :		97	Unoccupied - - -	14
1	Patrick Quin - - -	50	98	Dr. Mullin - - -	24
2	Patrick Murphy - - -	30	99	Owen Connolly - - -	8
3	Alexander Postley - - -	32	100	Thomas Jordan - - -	7
4	Adam Ledlie - - -	36	101		
5	Unoccupied - - -	16			

No.	Street and Occupant.	Assessed Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Assessed Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.
	<i>Canal-street—continued.</i>	£.		<i>Edward-street—continued.</i>	£.	
102	Mrs. Frazer - - -	16	13	Unoccupied - - -	15	
103	John Hynes - - -	6	14	Isaac Corry Reid - - -	15	
104	Mrs. Jefferson - - -	63	15	Daniel Collins - - -	45	
105	William Robinson - - -	9	16	Kirkwood & McCune - - -	70	
106	Eleanor Kinney - - -	10	17	William Handcock - - -	28	
107	Bernard Quin - - -	10	18	George Hill - - -	15	
108	Miss Donnelly - - -	9	19	James Bennie - - -	12	
109	Joseph Lyle - - -	36	20	Captain Ogle - - -	40	
110	Robert Modell - - -	22	21	Samsel Glennay - - -	50	
111	William Murdock - - -	18	22	James Byrne - - -	18	
112	David Todd - - -	45	23	James G. Quin - - -	36	
113	John Traynor - - -	52	24			
114	James Spruce - - -	34		<i>Catherine-street:</i>		
115	Unoccupied - - -	40	1	Peter Collins - - -	5	
116	William Dickson - - -	25	2	John Shanks - - -	5	
117	Eliza McCourt - - -	23	3	William Hamill - - -	13	
118			4	Captain Mansell - - -	6	
119			5	James Lawless - - -	5	
120			6	Hector McNeil - - -	8	
	<i>New-street:</i>		7	Anne Ryan - - -	8	
6	John Donnelly - - -	8	8	Felix McCullrick - - -	8	
7	John Crawford - - -	20	9	George Bennie - - -	8	
8	Robert Henry Ashe - - -	16	10	Joseph Bendy - - -	8	
9	Samuel Townly - - -	18	11	Patrick McCamley - - -	17	
10	Robert Henry Ashe - - -	10	12	William Isfell - - -	7	
11	Patrick Quin - - -	13	13	James Bell - - -	7	
12	Alexander Macdonnell - - -	40	14	James McCurdy - - -	7	
13	Isaac Lee - - -	16	15	James Jennett - - -	8	
14	Joseph Handcock - - -	24	16	James McFarland - - -	5	
15	Mrs. John Ogle - - -	30	17	Thomas Laffan - - -	5	
16	Thomas Cullen - - -	5	18	Patrick Collins - - -	5	
17	Unoccupied - - -	20	19	James McAfee - - -	5	
18	Ditto - - -	20	20	James Lyle - - -	5	
19	Arbuckle Halyday - - -	8	21	Captain Ogle - - -	10	
20			22	John Kilpatrick - - -	12	
21			23	David Heron - - -	13	
	<i>Barrack-street:</i>		24			
1	Jane Malone - - -	5		<i>Corry-square:</i>		
2	Mary Ann Thompson - - -	5				
3	William Shetton - - -	23		<i>Barracks.</i>		
4	Michael Walsh - - -	5				
5	Mrs. Storey - - -	16	1	John Quin - - -	7	
6	Mrs. Shetton - - -	22	2	John Reid - - -	40	
7	Unoccupied - - -	18	3	Mrs. Enkise - - -	40	
8	Ditto - - -	18	4	Captain Shields - - -	23	
9	Mrs. Michael - - -	12	5			
10			6			
	<i>Handcock's-court:</i>			<i>Cecil-street:</i>		
1	William White - - -	10	1	George Brown - - -	10	
			2	William Handcock - - -	5	
	<i>Edward-street:</i>			<i>Kiln-street:</i>		
1	Samuel Townly - - -	63	1	George Smith - - -	9	
2	Malcome Pierce - - -	16	2	James Magity - - -	7	
3	John Weir - - -	36	3	John Henry - - -	7	
4	Robert Henry Ashe - - -	48	4	Andrew McMinimay - - -	8	
5	White & Weir - - -	40	5	Elizabeth M'Waters - - -	12	
6	Robert Henry Asho - - -	6	6			
7	Frances Curvelle - - -	40		<i>Mongahan-street:</i>		
8						
9						
10	John Bennie - - -	53	3	Dennis Caulfield & Co. - - -	309	
11			4	Daniel Doherty - - -	5	
12			10	Henry Murdock - - -	17	

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.
	Monaghan-street—cont^d.	£.		King-street :	£.
11	Sarah Grant - - -	9	1	Robert Quin (nd front).	—
12	Unoccupied - - -	14	2	Benjamin Scott - - -	40
13	Ditto - - -	14	3	Redmond Cosgrove - - -	16
14	Michael Denvir - - -	5	4	Robert Jackson - - -	8
—	Mrs. Cochran - - -	14	5	Patrick Denvir - - -	8
15	Robert Bennet - - -	14	6	Robert M'Cleashan - - -	5
16	Isaac M'Cune - - -	14	7	James Collins - - -	13
17	Constantine Maguire - - -	50	10	James Michael - - -	5
18	Charles Jennings - - -	6	11	Anne Reeves - - -	5
20	Unoccupied - - -	9	13	Owen M'Parlan - - -	15
20½	James M'Cleashan - - -	5	14	William Wilson - - -	16
23	Ditto - - -	38	15	Michael M'Guigan - - -	8
24	Charles Jennings - - -	35	16	James Kelly - - -	9
	Bell's-row :		17	James Bryden - - -	9
1	Daniel Rodgers - - -	5	18	George Green - - -	9
2	Bernard M'O'Leary - - -	5	19	Bernard Burns - - -	26
3	James M'Bride - - -	5	20	Joseph Murphy - - -	42
4	Unoccupied - - -	5	21	William Callahan - - -	6
5	James Hoar - - -	5	22	Thomas M'Kee - - -	5
6	Terence Harvey - - -	5	23	Robert Little - - -	11
7	Hugh Connolly - - -	5	30	Unoccupied	28
8	Unoccupied - - -	5	31	Patrick Ruddy - - -	9
9	Henry Cassidy - - -	5	33	Alice Larkin - - -	6
10	Charles M'Abbe - - -	5	34	Anne Sheppard - - -	9
	Monaghan-row :		35	Richard Owen - - -	25
2	William Best - - -	7	36		
4	Fergus Campbell - - -	8		Butter Crane:	
6	Peter Maginnis - - -	8	1	Alexander Hill - - -	5
6	Patrick Loughran - - -	6	3	Unoccupied - - -	6
7	Thomas Maguire - - -	6	4	Ditto - - -	6
10	James M'Alister - - -	6	5	James M'Cleashan - - -	6
11	Unoccupied - - -	5	6	Unoccupied - - -	6
12	Walter Dunlop - - -	5	7	Ditto - - -	6
13	Peter M'Kay - - -	5	8	Ditto - - -	6
14	James M'Gowan - - -	5	9	Ditto - - -	6
15	Patrick M'Kinley - - -	5	10	Ditto - - -	6
16	Andrew Braaigan - - -	5	11	Ditto - - -	6
17	Alexander Pattison, jun. - - -	5	12	John J. Carter - - -	6
18	Alexander Pattison, sen. - - -	5	13	Unoccupied - - -	6
19	Patrick Ruddle - - -	5	14	Ditto - - -	6
20	William Brodley - - -	5	15	Ditto - - -	6
21	Daniel M'Donald - - -	5	16	John Nesbit - - -	—
22	Owen Toal - - -	5	17	James M'Henry - - -	5
23	William Ruddle - - -	5	18	John M'Gowan - - -	7
24	Mary Patterson - - -	5	19	Weigh-house and office - - -	10
25	John Rourke - - -	6		Needham-street.	
	Collins's-court :		1	Peter O'Neill - - -	7
—	Owen Tegart - - -	5	2	Mrs. Magee - - -	6
	Fulleton's-entry :		3	Mrs. Wilson - - -	9
—	Samuel Fullerton - - -	5	8	James Annett - - -	22
	Corn-market :		9	Mrs. Guy - - -	22
1	King's bonding-yard - - -	20	10	Henry Blackham - - -	24
2	George Guy - - -	20	10½	Unoccupied - - -	10
3	Earl Kilmorey's property - - -	10	11	Police barracks - - -	18
4	Unoccupied - - -	8	12	James M'Guinan - - -	5
			14	Edward Hamill - - -	5
			15	Joshua Bynon - - -	14
			16	Joseph Marshall - - -	8
			17	John Edwards - - -	8

No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	No.	Street and Occupant.	Annual Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Par- liament.	
	Needham-street—contd.	£.		Queen-street—continued.	£.		
18	Robert Sinclair - - -	8	39	Michael M'Kay - - -	5		
19	Thomas Benn - - -	8	43	Bernard Flanigan - - -	5		
20	Thomas Davis - - -	20	44	Unoccupied - - -	22		
21	Henry Gordon - - -	5	44½	Mrs. Russell - - -	23		
22	George Lockart - - -	5	45	Arthur Russell - - -	120		
23	James Hale - - -	5	45	Edward Mulligan - - -	5		
24	Unoccupied - - -	5	47	David M'Kay - - -	5		
25	Ditto - - -	5	48	Captain Seymour - - -	5		
26	Ditto - - -	5	49	John Huges - - -	6		
27	Margaret Doyle - - -	7	50	Patrick Bradley - - -	8		
28	Redmond Berry - - -	5	51	William M'Dade - - -	5		
29	John O'Hear - - -	5	52	George Gordon - - -	5		
30	James M'Evoy - - -	5	53	Roger Magenis - - -	7		
31	Rose Magenis - - -	5	54	Joseph Murphy - - -	7		
32	Unoccupied - - -	6	55	Michael O'Hear - - -	5		
33	Margaret Hawkins - - -	6					
34	Joseph M'Cormick - - -	6		Bridge-street :			
35	John M'Atter - - -	6		1	George Gregory - - -	13	
36	Hugh Toal - - -	18		2	Miss Reilly - - -	93	
				3	Miss M'Carley - - -	9	
	Queen-street :			4	Terence Duffy - - -	9	
1	David M'Blain - - -	13		5	Francis Morgan - - -	36	
2	Phillip Griffin - - -	16		5½	Unoccupied - - -	15	
3	John O'Hare - - -	15		6	William O'Farrell - - -	20	
4	Eather Bostick - - -	13		10	Unoccupied - - -	5	
5	Alexander Ross - - -	6			Ditto - - -	5	
6	Robert Savage - - -	6			Ditto - - -	5	
7	Robert Savage - - -	6		11	Stephen Traynor - - -	12	
8	Michael Murphy - - -	5		12	Mrs. Hanlon - - -	12	
9	Hugh M'Alindon - - -	7		13	Unoccupied - - -	20	
10	John Caffrey - - -	5		14	John Hamill - - -	5	
11	Thomas Hoey - - -	5		15	George Johnston - - -	7	
12	Patrick Crammy - - -	7		16	Mary Magee. - - -	--	
13	William Henry - - -	145		17	John Lockart - - -	25	
14	Edward Henry Courtney - - -	30		20	Dennis Caulfield & Co. - - -	150	
15	Robert Gordon - - -	13		21	John Byrne - - -	20	
24	Unoccupied - - -	12					
25	Grant James - - -	13			Turner-hill :		
26	Grant James - - -	13			Edward Turner - - -	100	
27	Captain Foester - - -	14					
28	James M'Henry - - -	10			Prospect-place :		
29	Unoccupied - - -	5			1	James Henderson - - -	16
30	John Gay - - -	5			2	Mrs. Wills - - -	18
31	John Duffy - - -	5			3	Adam Gay - - -	40
32	Patrick Murchen - - -	5					
33	John Burke - - -	7					
34	George Gay - - -	30					
35	Unoccupied - - -	10					
36	Moses M'Kigney - - -	6			Dromolane :		
37	George Maidoon - - -	6			Robert Hamilton - - -	5	
38	Thomas Morgan - - -	5			Rev. John Mischaell - - -	35	

P. S.—There are many other houses in the Borough of Newry, situated in different streets outside the limits, defined by the Commissioners under 9 Geo. 4, c. 82, of which houses the Commissioners have not any return. The high-constable is the officer to give such information, if required.

M. Fegan,
Clerk to the Commissioners.

Appendix (G.)

Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.Houses in the Town of Ntery (within the limits defined by the Commissioners under
9 Geo. 4, c. 82.) not assessed, by reason of said Houses being of less Annual Value than 5*l*.

No.	Street and Occupant.	No.	Street and Occupant.
	Hill-street :		Dounshire-court :
88	John Winters.	5	Patrick Maguire.
89	John Magee.		Water-street :
95	Thomas Campbell.		
	Maroon-street :	4	Unoccupied.
		6	Second front.
3	Samuel Banet.	21	John Bowden.
	Margaret-street.	23	John Moony.
		26	Susan Campbell.
83	Maurice Houghy, jun.	27	John M'Camley.
		28	Richard Bloxham.
	Mill :		Carlisle's-entry
8	John M'Kown.	1 to 3	Names not taken.
9	James M'Cartan.		Ellis's-entry :
10	Bernard Devlin.		
12	Maguire & M'Parlan.	1 to 6	Names not taken.
	Kilmorey-street :		Market-square :
91	Unoccupied.	2	Thomas Doran.
10		6 to 14	Small houses.
17			Power's-entry :
18			
19	Lawrence Ryan.		
20		1 to 5	Small houses.
21		7	Ditto.
25	Sarah Carr.		(Names taken by valors.)
26	Jane Latimer.		North-street, Lower :
27	Stephen Morgan.	7	David Anderson.
29	Alexander Baker.	14	Mary M'Danus.
29	Rose Conaway.	24	Thomas Weir.
31	Unoccupied.	58	Terence Conolly.
32	Arthur Meehan.		Lindsay's-hill.
49	Michael Burns.	7	James Thompson.
50	John Doolan.	8	Bridget Madden.
56	William Cowan.	9	Thomas Loo.
57	Peter Burns.	10	James Tigh.
58	Luke Bynes.		Dounshire-road :
52	William Hutchison.	-	Patrick Kenny.
	River-street :	-	Rodger O'Hess.
1	Patrick Griffin.	-	James Falloon.
2	James M'Gilligan.	-	Henry Walker.
3	Hugh Fenigan.		Sandy-street :
5	Alice Smith.	6	Bernard Smith.
6	James Weir.	8	Margaret Rooney.
7	Denis Marron.		Talbot-street :
8	Unoccupied.		
	Lower Water-street :	14	
4	Rice & Kenry.	15	
5	Charles M'Kew.	16	John Fowler.
6	Daniel Kenry.	17	
12	Bernard M'Cube.		Postley-place :
13	Unoccupied.	2 to 7	Small houses.
14	Richard Graham.		Mill Entry :
15	Elizabeth Rice.		
16	John M'Cre.	1 to 7	Small houses.
17	Edward Kelly.		
18	James Thompson.		
35	Unoccupied.		

No.	Street and Occupant.	No.	Street and Occupant.
4	Mill-lane :		High-street—continued.
5	Unoccupied.	54	Mathew Campbell.
		71	Abraham Hawthorn.
		75	Henry Magill.
3	George's-lane :	130	Stephen Roddy.
	Julia Keating.	135	Solonon Creilly.
1 to 6	St. Mary's-lane :		Barrack-lane :
	Small houses.	1	Henry Thompson.
			Canal-street :
21 to	Castle-street :		John Bonner.
24	Small houses.	39	James Murnaghan.
45	Stephen Cumming.	41	Alexander Ony.
47	Mary Magan.	80	
			Barrack-street
		5	William Newton.
8	Hide-market :	5	John Wylie.
9	Small houses.	7	Captain Mason.
11 to		13	William Henry.
13			Catherine-street :
	William-street :	15	John Bennie.
2	Andrew Trey.	29	Patrick Sheridan.
8	David Hynes.	30	James Spence.
			Monaghan-row :
7	Boat-street :	1	Hugh Burns.
10	John Malligan.	3	Catherine O'Hanlon.
12	Unoccupied.		
19	William M'Loughlin.		King-street :
24	Michael Callan.	8	William Maldoon.
26	Joseph Tunning.		
34	John Sands.		Buster Crane :
35	Unoccupied.	2	Samuel Townly.
37	Ditto.	16	John Nesbit.
38	Ditto.		
39	Terence M'Parlan.		Bridge-street :
49	Patrick Marron.	16	Mary Magee.
			Prospect-place :
	Bridewell-row :	4	John Mackey.
	Isaac Davidson.		
			Dromahane :
	High-street :	1	Hugh M'Cartan.
15	John Mercer.	2	William Hollywood.
17	Jane Graham.		
25	Peter John Rice.		

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

M. Fagan,
Clerk to the Commissioners.

TOWN OF YOUGHAL.

Names of Occupants.	Description of Premises.	Situation of Premises.	Estimated Annual Value.
			£.
Allen, Samuel	house	Nelson-place	50
Allen, Robert	ditto	Strand-street	12
Alexander, Robert	ditto	ditto	10
Alexander, James	ditto	Mall	18
Ditto	ditto	Water-lane	15
Arnold, George, and tenants	ditto	ditto	10
Aherm, John	forge	Nile-street	5
Atkinson, Henry	stable	Quay	7
Ditto	house	Catherine-street	40
Armstrong, John	ditto	North Main-street	16
Ahern, David	ditto	ditto	18

Appendix (G.)
 HOUSES IN TOWNS
 WHICH RETURN
 MEMBERS TO PAR-
 LIAMENT.

Names of Occupants.	Description of Premises.	Situation of Premises.	Estimated Annual Value.
Ahearn, Thedy	house, &c.	North Main-street	£. 32
Ahearn, Wm., & Co., tenants	house	ditto	7
Amour, John	ditto	Tallow-street	14
Ditto	ditto	South Main-street	5
Ditto	ditto	ditto	5
Ash, James	ditto	North Main-street	23
Ahearn, Beverly	ditto	Cross-lane	6
Armonth, William	ditto	North Main-street	16
Adams, William	ditto	Meeting-house-lane	10
Adams, Wallis	ditto	Nelson-place	25
Burclem, Elizabeth	ditto	Strand-street	11
Bowen, William	ditto	ditto	10
Bowles, Mrs.	ditto	Mall	36
Bury, Thos., & Co., tenants	ditto	ditto	10
Burnell, Thomas	shop	ditto	8
Byrne, Elizabeth	house	Hanover-street	18
Burke, Catherine	ditto	ditto	5
Bowden, John	ditto	Fox-lane	9
Beadbaw, Margaret	ditto	Market-square	6
Bowles, Mary, & Co., tenants	ditto	ditto	18
Bridge Commissioners	ferry-house	Quay	5
Blackburn, Matthew	store	Browne-street	25
Barson, Mrs.	house	Catherine-street	21
Beynon, Captain	ditto	South Main-street	16
Bratt, John	ditto	ditto	7
Brian, Peter	ditto	ditto	6
Bennet, John	ditto	ditto	15
Burke, Joanna	shop	Quay-lane	5
Brian, William	ditto	ditto	5
Brash, Robert	house	ditto	8
Brian, Edmund	ditto	South Main-street	10
Beckmaster, Wm., & Co.	ditto	North Main-street	35
Bateman, Edward, repre- sentatives of.	ditto	ditto	25
Bateman, Elizabeth, & Co.	ditto	ditto	30
Berke, James	ditto	ditto	8
Bail, Bob Stowell	ditto	ditto	28
Barry, Mrs.	ditto	ditto	6
Broderick, Mrs., & Co., tenants.	ditto	Tallow-street	11
Beckmaster, George	ditto	ditto	18
Bryan, Widow, & Co., tenants	ditto	North Main-street	5
Barry, Maurice	ditto	ditto	24
Bryen, Henry	ditto	ditto	30
Bassett, Wm., & Co., tenants	ditto	ditto	16
Barry, Garret	ditto	William-street	13
Brown, Henry	ditto	ditto	16
Bolcher, Edward	ditto	Cross-lane	8
Browne, Francis	ditto	ditto	8
Bonne, James	shop	North Main-street	10
Browne, Thomas	house	ditto	30
Blackall, James	ditto	ditto	16
Blain, William	shop, &c.	ditto	9
Barry, William	house	ditto	24
Ditto	ditto	South Main-street	24
Burke, David	ditto	Meeting-house-lane	10
Barret, James	ditto	ditto	18
Ditto, & Co., tenants	ditto	ditto	5
Ballard, Thomas	ditto	ditto	19
Browne, Francis	ditto	North Main-street	14
Braze, Dennis	ditto	ditto	12
Barrows, Ambrose	ditto	South Main-street	12
Browne, Jane	ditto	ditto	20
Baldges, Mrs.	ditto	ditto	7
Baron, Thomas	shop	ditto	5
Buckley, Daniel	house	ditto	12
Browne, Miss	ditto	ditto	25
Bryen, Thos. & Co., tenants	ditto	ditto	12

Names of Occupants.	Description of Premises.	Situation of Premises.	Estimated Annual Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
Bateman & Sparrow	house	North Main-street	£. 50	
Butterfield, Anne, & Co., tenants.	ditto	South Main-street	7	
Brown, John, Gardner, Joseph, Coughlan, John.	ditto	North Main-street	30	
Convent	ditto	South Abbey	60	
Campbell, John	ditto	Strand-street	12	
Callon, Mrs.	shop	ditto	5	
Conway, James	house and forge	Mall	5	
Cotter, James	house	ditto	12	
Calvin, Michael	ditto	ditto	13	
Clancy, Thomas	ditto	ditto	20	
Connell, James	ditto	ditto	16	
Carey, John	shop	Hanover-street	8	
Campbell, Hannah	house	ditto	16	
Connery, John	ditto	Fox-lane	12	
Cashman, Michael	ditto	ditto	18	
Coleman, John	ditto	Market-square	38	
Corporation	fish-market	Quay	10	
Ditto	meat-market	Grattan-street	10	
Ditto	pound	North Main-street	10	
Cox, Richard, jun.	yard	Grattan-street	12	
Corporation	old market	Market-square	10	
Cox, Richard, jun.	house	Bean-street	10	
Curtin, Thomas	ditto	Ment Market-lane	10	
Ditto	meat-market	ditto	20	
Ditto	ground	North Main-street	5	
Coughlan, John	house	Ment Market-lane	8	
Colebert, Edward	ditto	Brown-street	14	
Carberry, William	ditto	Catherine-street	21	
Ditto	store	Quay	60	
Curran, Jacob	house	Brown-street	13	
Commissioners for lighting and cleansing.	yard	Quay	10	
Clarke, William	house	Grattan-street	40	
Ditto	garage	Gillet's-hill	6	
Canningham, Patrick	house	South Main-street	20	
Canningham, William	ditto	ditto	10	
Coffee, Elizabeth	shop	ditto	5	
Coffee, John	house	Quay-lane	9	
Coffee, Widow	ditto	South Main-street	12	
Correen, Edmund	ditto	North Main-street	22	
Correen, Jane	ditto	ditto	20	
Cashman, James	ditto	ditto	10	
Conway, William	ditto	ditto	7	
Croker, Robert	ditto	Tallow-street	18	
Cooke, Thomas	ditto	ditto	18	
Cox, Richard, & Co.	salt works	ditto	18	
Cox, John	house	North Main-street	14	
Cashman, Michael	ditto	ditto	14	
Canningham, Roger	ditto	ditto	14	
Conoly, Edward	ditto	ditto	26	
Campbell, Anne	ditto	ditto	45	
Conservative stables		William-street	10	
Cavanah, Mrs.	house	ditto	15	
Curry, Charles	house and ground	North Main-street	10	
Coleman, Michael	shop, &c.	ditto	8	
Curry, Richard	house	ditto	12	
Coffee, James	ditto	South Main-street	16	
Correen, Patrick	ditto	ditto	16	
Cashman, Patrick	ditto	ditto	18	
Counce, William	ditto	ditto	10	
Cowry, —	ditto	ditto	5	
Carthy, Callahan	ditto	Windmill-lane	6	
Crosby, John	ditto	Bean-street	7	
Clarke, John	ditto	ditto	10	
Cunningham, David	ditto	Fox-lane	8	
Canningham, Roger	ditto	Market-square	18	

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Towns
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

Names of Occupants.	Demonstration of Premises.	Situation of Premises.	Estimated Annual Value.
Drew, Pierce William	house	Devonshire-place	£. 45
Doy, James	ditto	Strand-street	10
Ditto	ditto	ditto	12
Delany, Anne	ditto	ditto	20
Ditto	stables	ditto	6
Denmesde, Samuel	house	ditto	6
Ditto	ditto	Meat-market-lane	7
Dewey, Hannah	shop	Mail	5
Denny, John	house	Hanover-street	18
Dukes, William	ditto	Fox-lane	8
Dunn, William	-	Bachelor's-walk	13
Donovan, John	house	Quay	12
Dooley, John, & Co., tenants	ditto	South Main-street	8
Driscoll, R., & Co., tenants	ditto	ditto	5
Devonshire, Duke of	college	Nelson-place	200
Ditto	store	Quay	110
Ditto	small-house	Mail	90
Ditto	house	Brown-street	10
Ditto	yard	ditto	10
Ditto	stables	Church-street	15
Ditto	almshouses	ditto	10
Ditto	ditto	North Main-street	80
Daly, Dennis, & Co., tenants	house	South Main-street	5
Denmesde, Daniel	ditto	North Main-street	12
Dart, Elizabeth	ditto	ditto	26
Dartnell, Edward	ditto	ditto	28
Danold, Thomas	ditto	ditto	14
Drury, Jasper	ditto	Tallow-street	28
Ditto	store	ditto	25
Digby, Edward	house	William-street	18
Daly & Co., tenants	ditto	North Main-street	8
Desmond, John	ditto	Nelson-place	30
Ditto	stable	Cross-lane	5
Denny, P. & Co., tenants	house	ditto	5
Donovan, Stephen	foundry, &c.	North Main-street	12
Davis, William, & M. Lee	house	ditto	22
Doherty, William	ditto	ditto	26
Darey, Hugh	ditto	South Main-street	6
Daly, Edward	ditto	ditto	16
Dexter, Mess., & Co., tenants	ditto	ditto	9
Davis, Robert	ditto	ditto	20
Daint, Miss	ditto	Nelson-place	30
Downes, Frances	ditto	Beau-street	10
Duffy, Pat., & Co., tenants	ditto	Cross-lane	5
Elliott, Elizabeth	garden	Devonshire-place	18
Evens, George	house	Brown-street	15
Eltus, William	ditto	Tallow-street	18
Ditto	paddock	ditto	7
Edwards, Abraham	house	South Main-street	10
Eustace, John	deal-yards	Quay	45
Ditto	bonding-yard	ditto	12
Ditto	house	Tallow-street	18
Ditto	ditto	ditto	18
Ditto	ditto	ditto	18
Ditto	yard	ditto	12
Egar, Alexander	house	North Main-street	22
Egar, Robt., & Co., tenants	ditto	ditto	10
English, F., & Co., tenants	shop	ditto	6
Elms, John, & Co., tenants	house	ditto	7
Elmore, Christopher	ditto	ditto	16
Egan, James	ditto	Beau-street	10
Edwards, Thomas	ditto	ditto	10
Eustace, Harvey	ditto	ditto	8
Fitzgerald, John	store	Strand-street	10
Ficeman, Nath	house	ditto	26
Ditto	coach-house	ditto	5
Farmer, George	house	ditto	12

Names of Occupiers.	Description of Premises.	Situation of Premises.	Estimated Annual Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
Foolker, representatives of Thomas.	house - - -	Water-lane - - -	£. 14	
Flin, James - - -	store, &c. - - -	Bachelor's-walk - - -	30	
Flin, Thomas - - -	house - - -	Market-square - - -	15	
Ditto - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - - -	16	
Fisher, John Charles - - -	ditto - - -	Quay - - -	9	
Flin, Joanna - - -	ditto - - -	Market-square - - -	22	
Ditto - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	13	
Foley, Edmund - - -	ditto - - -	Meat-market-lane - - -	9	
Finn, Robert - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - - -	16	
Foley, John, & Co., tenants	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	5	
Fox, Thomas - - -	shop - - -	- ditto - - -	5	
Fudge, John - - -	house - - -	- ditto - - -	12	
Fitzgerald & Taylor - - -	ditto - - -	North Main-street - - -	22	
Finnegan, William - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	8	
Freeman, Joseph James - - -	castle - - -	- ditto - - -	8	
Farell, John, & Co., tenants	house - - -	- ditto - - -	8	
Fletcher, Edward, & Co., tenants.	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	5	
Fisher, Maria - - -	house, &c. - - -	Tallow-street - - -	35	
Ditto - - -	pottery - - -	North Main-street - - -	30	
Fitzgerald, George - - -	house - - -	- ditto - - -	8	
Fitzgerald, James - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	18	
Fisher, Joseph Reuben - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	28	
Fisher, Abraham - - -	house and store - - -	- ditto - - -	20	
Foley, Mary - - -	house - - -	- ditto - - -	20	
Farmer, Miss - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - - -	18	
Fitzgerald, William - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	16	
Faunt, Thomas - - -	ditto - - -	Nelson-place - - -	63	
Guayon, Thomas - - -	ditto - - -	North Main-street - - -	5	
Gregory, David - - -	ditto - - -	South Abbey - - -	40	
Ditto - - -	stable - - -	- ditto - - -	6	
Green, Samuel - - -	house - - -	- ditto - - -	27	
Ditto - - -	garden - - -	Strand-street - - -	10	
Ditto - - -	store - - -	Quay - - -	100	
Ditto - - -	coal-yard - - -	ditto - - -	15	
Green, Roger - - -	house - - -	Catherine-street - - -	21	
Ditto - - -	stable - - -	Quay - - -	11	
Green, William Spenswood	house - - -	Catherine-street - - -	21	
Ditto - - -	store - - -	- ditto - - -	55	
Green, James Ellis - - -	house - - -	- ditto - - -	31	
Green, Thomas - - -	yard - - -	Strand-street - - -	3	
Ginlet, Thomas - - -	store - - -	- ditto - - -	5	
Ditto - - -	yard - - -	- ditto - - -	6	
Ditto - - -	house - - -	- ditto - - -	13	
Ditto - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - - -	10	
Ditto - - -	store - - -	Water-lane - - -	5	
Gudner, Nathaniel - - -	house - - -	- ditto - - -	8	
Green, Tanner - - -	ditto - - -	Mall - - -	20	
Gorman, John - - -	ditto - - -	Quay - - -	9	
Gre, James - - -	ditto - - -	Browne-street - - -	20	
Gray, John B. - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - - -	26	
Gardner, William - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	20	
Griffin, John - - -	ditto - - -	Quay-lane - - -	5	
Griffith, Mary - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - - -	24	
Gudner, Thomas B. - - -	ditto - - -	Beau-street - - -	20	
Griffin, William - - -	ditto - - -	Quay-lane - - -	6	
Green, Nicholas - - -	ditto - - -	North Main-street - - -	18	
Garde, Henry P. - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	26	
Ditto - - -	yard - - -	- ditto - - -	8	
Giles, George - - -	stables, &c. - - -	Church-street - - -	10	
Giles, Richard - - -	store, &c. - - -	- ditto - - -	20	
Ditto - - -	breeding-ground - - -	North Main-street - - -	20	
Ditto - - -	house - - -	Nelson-place - - -	40	
Giles, Misses - - -	ditto - - -	Church-street - - -	28	
Gorge, George - - -	ditto - - -	Cross-lane - - -	8	
Gibson, John - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - - -	18	
Graves, James - - -	ditto - - -	Nelson-place - - -	45	

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Town
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

Name of Occupant.	Description of Premises.	Situation of Premises.	Estimated Annual Value.
Green, Alicia	house	Nelson-place	£.
Geary, John	ditto	Beau-street	70
Gulman, Michael	ditto	South Main-street	6
Geary, Dennis, & Co., tenants	ditto	North Main-street	18
Homan, Sir William	ditto	Clifton	9
Hayman, Matthew	ditto	South Abbey	190
Hayes, Mrs.	ditto	ditto	50
Howard, Luke	store	Strand-street	5
Ditto	coach-house	Mall	5
Ditto	house	ditto	22
Howard, Anne, & Co., tenants	stables	ditto	10
Ditto	house	Hanover-street	9
Hamilton, John	ditto	Strand-street	22
Hughes, Richard	house and yard	Water-lane	12
Haley, Peter	house and forge	ditto	5
Haley, Thomas	house	Hanover-street	5
Husley, Timothy	ditto	Market-square	18
Hemery, Maurice	store	Quay	82
Hangan, Cornelius	house	Nile-street	6
Harley, William	ditto	ditto	10
Hollahan, Jas., & Co., tenants	ditto	Mass-market-lane	7
Heffernan, Patrick	store	Catherine-street	30
Hogan, Patrick	house	Brown-street	14
Ditto	stables	William-street	6
Heasley, G. Barnes	house	Brown-street	18
Ditto	ditto	North Main-street	11
Harvey, Thomas	house, &c.	Grattan-street	55
Hickey, Richard	shop	South Main-street	5
Hell, John	house	Quay-lane	6
Hingston, Deborah	ditto	North Main-street	24
Hanshor, John	shop	ditto	8
Harley, Cornelius	house	ditto	20
Hudson, Wm., & Co., tenants	ditto	ditto	8
Hudson, John	store	ditto	25
Hallahan, Michael	shop	ditto	6
Heffernan, Patrick, & Co., tenants.	house	Tallow-street	10
Harty, John	ditto	North Main-street	5
Hingston, James	ditto	ditto	35
Hammet, Mrs.	ditto	William-street	10
Hannon, John	ditto	Cross-lane	8
Ditto	ditto	ditto	8
Ditto	ditto	ditto	8
Ditto	ditto	ditto	8
Heffernan, Edward, & P. Hickey.	ditto	ditto	6
Harrison, Wm. Abraham	ditto	North Main-street	16
Harley, Cornelius	pig-yard	ditto	16
Hackett, Mrs.	house	Meeting-house-lane	5
Hayes, William	ditto	ditto	7
Hughes, Benjamin	ditto	North Main-street	18
Harris, Daniel	ditto	ditto	15
Howe, John	ditto	ditto	15
Hayes, Roger	ditto	ditto	6
Hyde, Arthur	ground	South Main-street	10
Hoade & Andrews	house	Beau-street	7
Harvey, Elizabeth	house, &c.	Gillet's-hill	30
Jack-on, Benjamin	ditto	Devonshire-place	50
Ditto	store	Quay	78
Ditto	coal-yard	ditto	12
John, Thomas, jun.	garden	South Abbey	12
Ditto	house	North Main-street	95
Joice, Catherine	ditto	Water-lane	8
Irwin, Thomas	ditto	Mall-lane	12
Jackson, Richard	ditto	South Main-street	18
John, Thomas	ditto	North Main-street	28
Ditto	store	Quay	105

Names of Occupants.	Description of Premises.	Streets of Premises.	Estimated Annual Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
Jones, Robert - - -	house - - -	North Main-street - - -	£. 30	
Independent Coach Comp.	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	22	
Ditto - - - - -	stables - - -	William-street - - -	10	
Jenkins, John - - -	house - - -	North Main-street - - -	24	
Ditto - - - - -	ditto - - -	William-street - - -	15	
Johnson, Andrew - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	9	
Irwin, John - - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	20	
Johns, Thomas - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - - -	14	
Jerroin, Joseph - - -	ditto - - -	Nelson-place - - -	45	
Keefe, David, and J. Fitzgerald.	ditto - - -	Market-square - - -	22	
Kelly, John - - - -	ditto - - -	Fox-lane - - - - -	8	
Kearney, James - - -	coal-yard - - -	Quay - - - - -	15	
Ditto - - - - -	house, &c. - - -	Gratton-street - - -	20	
Keefe, Patrick - - -	ditto - - -	Nile-street - - - -	10	
Keating, Henry - - -	house and forge - - -	Quay - - - - -	7	
Kenyes, Samuel - - -	store - - - - -	Gratton-street - - -	50	
Kilmartin, W. & Co., tenants	house - - - - -	South Main-street - - -	5	
Kennedy, Patrick - - -	ditto - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	7	
Keene, Robert - - - -	ditto - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	8	
Kine, Mary - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	North Main-street - - -	20	
Knight, Miss, & W. Hayes	ditto - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	8	
Kelly, John - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	10	
Kelly, Michael - - - -	house - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	6	
Kelleher, John - - - -	ditto - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	8	
Kenare, John - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	Cork-lane - - - - -	8	
Ditto & Co., tenants - - -	ditto - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	6	
Kenah, Thomas - - - -	ditto - - - - -	North Main-street - - -	24	
Kenealy, Widow - - - -	house and garden - - -	Cross-lane - - - - -	8	
Kanblin, Frederick - - -	house - - - - -	Meeting-house-lane - - -	7	
Káhal, Sobieskie - - - -	store - - - - -	Windmill-lane - - - -	20	
Lowler, Mrs. - - - - -	house - - - - -	South Main-street - - -	20	
Lohan, Michael - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	Strand-street - - - -	5	
Lanley, Hugh - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	Mall - - - - -	50	
Linch, Mary, & Co., tenants	ditto - - - - -	Mall-lane - - - - -	8	
Lawton, John - - - - -	shop - - - - -	Hanover-street - - - -	8	
Leary, Bridget - - - - -	house - - - - -	Nile-street - - - - -	10	
Ditto - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	10	
Ditto & Co., tenants - - -	ditto - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	10	
Ditto - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	North Main-street - - -	25	
Linch, Nicholas - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	Nile-street - - - - -	10	
Lesley, John - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	Meat-market lane - - -	8	
Lindsay, John - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	Brown-street - - - - -	14	
Lomb, Wm. & Robert - - -	store - - - - -	Gratton-street - - - -	50	
Ditto - - - - -	yards - - - - -	Quay - - - - -	18	
Lamb, Percy - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	15	
Leahy, David - - - - -	house - - - - -	South Main-street - - -	6	
Long, Jeremiah - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	24	
Ditto - - - - -	coach-house - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	6	
Leonard, William - - - -	house - - - - -	North Main-street - - -	20	
Leary, F., & Geo. Griffith	ditto - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	12	
Linnans, John - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	Cork-lane - - - - -	9	
Linsam, James - - - - -	shop, &c. - - - - -	North Main-street - - -	5	
Lowe, Thomas - - - - -	house - - - - -	Church-street - - - -	25	
Lovet, Jonathan - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	William-street - - - -	18	
Linch, Jas., & Co., tenants	ditto - - - - -	Meeting-house-lane - - -	0	
Lorray, Patrick - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	South Main-street - - -	12	
Loughlan & Co., tenants -	ditto - - - - -	- ditto - - - - -	6	
Mould, Mrs. - - - - -	ditto - - - - -	South Abbey - - - - -	27	
Markham, John - - - - -	ditto, &c. - - - - -	North Main-street - - -	42	
Ditto - - - - -	stable - - - - -	South Abbey - - - - -	5	
Meade, Ann - - - - -	house - - - - -	Strand-street - - - -	18	

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Town
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

Names of Occupants.	Description of Premises.	Situation of Premises.	Estimated Annual Value.
Murry, Patrick	house	Hanover-street	10
Ditto	ditto	ditto	12
Ditto	ditto	Quay	18
Molony, Thomas	ditto	Hanover-street	10
Murry, Richard	ditto	ditto	10
Malloway, Patrick, & Co., tenants.	ditto	Market-square	15
Mahony, Thomas	ditto	Nile-street	8
Meara, William	ditto	Meeting-house-lane	3
Ditto	store	Nile-street	6
Moore, Peter	house and store	Browne-street	55
Mangan, Michael, & Co., tenants.	house	South Main-street	5
Moore, Mrs., & Co., tenants	ditto	ditto	7
M'Grath & Co., tenants	ditto	ditto	6
Mossey, Alicia	ditto	ditto	24
Murphy, Widow	ditto	Quay-lane	12
Mansfield, Patrick	ditto	ditto	8
Moun, Matthew	ditto	North Main-street	35
Mullins, Richard	ditto	ditto	14
M'Neal, Felix	ditto	ditto	10
M'Mahon, John	ditto	ditto	32
Miller, Rich., & Co., tenants	ditto	ditto	10
Magin, Dennis	ditto	ditto	20
Morgan, Anne	ditto	ditto	40
Moore, John	ditto	Cork-lane	8
Murry, Patrick	shop	Tallow-street	6
Meade, Jeremiah	house	ditto	18
M'Guire, Widow James	ditto	North Main-street	5
Merry, Michael	ditto	ditto	12
Morgan, James	ditto	ditto	23
Morgan, Richard	garden	Church-street	8
Melin, Susanna	pawn-office	North Main-street	10
Ditto	house	ditto	50
Nooe, John	ditto	Cross-lane	5
Morgan, Edward & Richard	ditto	North Main-street	28
Meade, Anne	ditto	South Main-street	18
Millerick, Edward	ditto	ditto	5
Murphy, Patrick	ditto	Windmill-lane	6
M'Carthy, Mary	ditto	South Main-street	30
Murphy, Thomas	ditto	ditto	8
Merry, John	ditto, &c.	ditto	60
Murphy, Daniel	ditto	Nelson-place	22
M'Namara & Co., tenants	ditto	North Main-street	10
Merrick, Elizabeth	ditto	ditto	32
M'Grath, Margaret	ditto	South Main-street	24
Neale & Flavin	ditto	Strand-street	6
Northeast, Mrs.	ditto	ditto	12
Nason, Wm., & Co., tenants	ditto	South Main-street	8
Neale, Thos., & Co., tenants	ditto	North Main-street	6
Nolan, Widow	ditto	Tallow-street	18
Newby, Nathan	ditto	Cross-lane	7
Neagle, Maurice	ditto	North Main-street	30
Nicholson, Philip	ditto	Beau-street	9
O'Neill, John	salt works	Strand-street	10
O'Neill, John, jun.	house	South Main-street	20
O'Connet, Dennis	ditto	Strand-street	12
O'Brien, Thomas	ditto	Market-square	22
O'Brien, John	ditto	Quay	7
Osborn, Michael	ditto	South Main-street	8
O'Brien, Thomas	shop, &c.	ditto	7
O'Connell, Daniel	house	Cross-lane	8

Names of Occupiers.	Description of Premises.	Situation of Premises.	Estimated Annual Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
O'Brien, Kennedy	forge	William-street	£	
Ditto	house	Gillet's-hill	6	
Oshorn, William	ditto	North Main-street	7	
O'Lomasney, Jeremiah	ditto	South Main-street	22	
O'Neill, Ellen	ditto	North Main-street	16	
Power, John	ditto	Belvue	88	
Parker, Henry	ditto	Devonshire-place	80	
Ditto	field	ditto	90	
Police Barrack		Strand-street	10	
Paterson, Elizabeth	house	Mail	12	
Palmer, Arthur	ditto	Honover-street	18	
Parker, Margaret	ditto	Browne-street	15	
Poncloe, Robert	ditto	ditto	14	
Poynts, Thomas	ditto	ditto	12	
Parker, W. & Edward	steele	ditto	18	
Ditto	yard	Quay	30	
Penrose, Samuel Neal	ditto	ditto	15	
Ditto	house	Catherine-street	12	
Prendergast, James	ditto	North Main-street	21	
Parson, Edward	ditto	ditto	34	
Prendergast, William	shop	ditto	5	
Pilkington, Richard	house	ditto	12	
Ditto	ditto	William-street	15	
Ditto	stable	North Main-street	6	
Prendergast, Widow	house	ditto	10	
Prendergast, James			5	
Perks, Mrs.	house	William-street	14	
Pect, George	ditto	North Main-street	36	
Prendergast, William, & Co., tenants.	ditto	Windmill-lane	5	
Prendergast, John	ditto	Quay-lane	8	
Protestant Asylum	ditto	North Main-street	16	
Parker, Leonard	ditto	ditto	14	
Power, John	ditto	South Main-street	18	
Power, the representatives of Mrs.	ditto	ditto	18	
Pool, Walter Croker	ditto	Nelson place	30	
Poillon, John	ditto	ditto	50	
Quinn, Richard	ditto	Meat-market-lane	8	
Quinn, Daniel, & Co., tenants.	shop	North Main-street	8	
Roche, George	house	Devonshire-place	45	
Rogers, George	ditto	ditto	70	
Rogers, Robert Alkin	ditto	South Abbey	27	
Ditto	garden	ditto	12	
Roper, Robert	house	Mail	14	
Rowe, Patrick	ditto	Quay	22	
Ronsyue, John	ditto	Nile-street	14	
Reuby, Philip	ditto	South Main-street	92	
Ditto	store	Windmill-lane	5	
Rea, George, & Co., tenants	house	South Main-street	7	
Ronayne, Patrick	ditto	ditto	12	
Ditto	ditto	North Main-street	25	
Ronayne, Richard	ditto	ditto	24	
Roche, David	ditto	ditto	14	
Regan, Cecilia	shop	ditto	5	
Ronayne, James	house	ditto	21	
Ronayne, Richard	ditto	ditto	50	
Ditto	ground	ditto	5	
Ronayne, Tobias	house	ditto	12	
Rian, James	ditto	ditto	8	
Richardson, Thomas	ditto	ditto	95	
Ditto	ditto	William-street	5	
Ronayne, D. Phillip	ditto	ditto	15	
Ronayne, James	ditto	ditto	14	
Ditto	stable	ditto	5	

Appendix (G.)
Houses in Town
which return
Members to Par-
liament.

Names of Occupants.	Description of Premises.	Situation of Premises.	Estimated Annual Value.
Rodesick, H. Esles - -	house - - -	Hill - - -	£ 10
Russel, Vincent - - -	ditto - - -	North Main-street - - -	24
Ryaner & Taylor - - -	store - - -	Tallow-street - - -	18
Ryan, John - - -	house - - -	North Main-street - - -	18
Roche, James - - -	shop - - -	- ditto - - -	6
Rouayac, Robert, & Co., tenants.	house - - -	Cross-lane - - -	6
Smyth, Cary William - -	ditto - - -	Strand-street - - -	22
Seward, Thomas - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	10
Sinkins, George - - -	ditto - - -	Mall - - -	28
- Ditto - - -	yard - - -	Grattan-street - - -	8
Smiddy, Maurice - - -	house - - -	Mall - - -	5
Stack, John - - -	ditto - - -	Water-lane - - -	12
Spratt, Jacob - - -	ditto - - -	Mall - - -	18
Sullivan, John - - -	ditto - - -	Mall-lane - - -	8
Smyth, Mary - - -	ditto - - -	Fox-lane - - -	8
Sullivan, James - - -	ditto - - -	Market-square - - -	17
- Ditto - - -	salt works - - -	Browne-street - - -	22
Sullivan, Daniel, & Co., tenants.	house, &c. - - -	Market-square - - -	14
Scarsden, James - - -	shop - - -	Quay - - -	6
Sidley, John - - -	house - - -	Browne-street - - -	10
Strood, Thomas - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	8
Stewart, Alexander - -	ditto - - -	Catherine-street - - -	45
Studdy, John - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - - -	21
- Ditto - - -	stable - - -	- ditto - - -	5
Snow, George - - -	house - - -	- ditto - - -	16
Seward, Edward - - -	shop - - -	- ditto - - -	7
Sheenan, Widow, & Co., tenants.	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	8
- Ditto - - -	house - - -	- ditto - - -	24
Sweeny, Michael - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	12
Shea, Michael - - -	ditto - - -	Quay-lane - - -	6
Stamstreet, Richard - -	ditto - - -	North Main-street - - -	26
Singleton, Elizabeth - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	18
Sims, Thomas - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	24
Saugster, James - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	20
Swayne, James - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	36
- Ditto - - -	stable - - -	William-street - - -	6
Sheesa, Bartholomew, & Co., tenants.	house - - -	North Main-street - - -	8
Scanlan, John - - -	ditto - - -	Cross-lane - - -	5
Shields, Dss., & Co., tenants	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	5
Shea, Cornelius - - -	ditto - - -	Meeting-house-lane - - -	5
Scott, William - - -	ditto - - -	Nelson-place - - -	30
Savings' Bank - - -	- - -	- ditto - - -	20
Troter, Edward - - -	house - - -	Strand-street - - -	22
- Ditto - - -	yard - - -	- ditto - - -	18
- Ditto - - -	store - - -	Nile-street - - -	25
- Ditto - - -	stable - - -	- ditto - - -	6
Torbuck, George - - -	house - - -	Mall - - -	24
- Ditto - - -	store - - -	Bachelor's-walk - - -	15
Torbuck, Richard - - -	house - - -	Mall - - -	18
Torbuck, Geo. & Richard -	store - - -	Quay - - -	20
- Ditto - - -	yard - - -	Nile-street - - -	5
Torbuck, Graham - - -	house - - -	North Main-street - - -	21
Towny, Michael - - -	shop - - -	Market-square - - -	10
Thomas, George - - -	house - - -	Quay - - -	9
Taylor, Thomas Richard -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - - -	30
Thomas, George - - -	ditto - - -	North Main-street - - -	15
Thomas, Henry - - -	ditto - - -	William-street - - -	12
Thomas, John - - -	ditto - - -	North Main-street - - -	8
Thomas, Edward - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	12
Thomas, Giles, & tenants	ditto - - -	Cross-lane - - -	8
Taylor, Jane - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - - -	18
Taylor, William - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	22
Unacke, Catherine - - -	ditto - - -	William-street - - -	15

Name of Occupier.	Description of Premises.	Situate of Premises.	Estimated Annual Value.	Appendix (G.) Houses in Towns which return Members to Parliament.
Verlin, Joseph - - -	house - - -	South Main-street - -	£	
Verlin, William - - -	ditto - - -	North Main-street - -	6	
Ditto - - -	yard - - -	- ditto - - -	36	
Ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	10	
Vittery, Catherine - - -	house - - -	- ditto - - -	26	
Walsh, Henry Pierce - - -	ditto - - -	South Abbey - - -	35	
Wallis, Alice - - -	ditto - - -	Strand - - -	22	
Walsh, Catherine - - -	ditto - - -	Strand-street - - -	28	
Ditto - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - -	32	
Ditto - - -	store - - -	- ditto - - -	6	
Whelan, Patrick - - -	house - - -	South Abbey - - -	13	
Wigmore, John M. - - -	ditto - - -	Mall - - -	12	
Walsh, James - - -	ditto - - -	Market-square - - -	22	
Whelan, Patrick - - -	ditto - - -	Grattan-street - - -	12	
Walsh, Patrick - - -	ditto - - -	Quay - - -	9	
Ward, William - - -	ditto - - -	Browne-street - - -	10	
Ditto - - -	stables - - -	- ditto - - -	15	
White, William - - -	house - - -	- ditto - - -	12	
Ward, William - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - -	28	
Walsh, Widow - - -	ditto - - -	Quay-lane - - -	5	
Walsh, Widow - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - -	18	
Wigmore, William - - -	ditto - - -	North Main-street - -	26	
Walsh, Edward - - -	ditto, &c. - - -	- ditto - - -	55	
Walsh, Richard, & Co. - - -	coal-yard - - -	Quay - - -	14	
White, William - - -	house - - -	North Main-street - -	8	
Wakeham, William - - -	ditto - - -	Church-street - - -	18	
Walsh, Widow - - -	ditto - - -	William-street - - -	25	
Wither, Pat., & Co., tenants - - -	shop - - -	North Main-street - -	8	
Walsh, Richard - - -	house - - -	Gillet's-lane - - -	15	
Wigmore & Blackall - - -	yard - - -	William-street - - -	5	
Walsh, Patrick - - -	house - - -	- ditto - - -	14	
Whealey, Robert - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	36	
Wigmore, Thomas - - -	ditto - - -	North Main-street - -	26	
Wigmore, James - - -	ditto - - -	Cross-lane - - -	5	
Walsh, John - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	5	
Walsh, William - - -	ditto - - -	North Main-street - -	20	
Wigmore, Widow - - -	ditto - - -	- ditto - - -	10	
Wigmore, Arthur - - -	ditto - - -	Meeting-house-lane - -	18	
White, James Garde - - -	ditto - - -	South Main-street - -	19	
Ditto - - -	yard - - -	- ditto - - -	20	

Houses in the town of Youghal are not distinguished by numbers.

The foregoing return is a copy of the registry founded upon the last valuation, made and verified upon oath, the 17th day of September 1835, for the three years next succeeding the 31st day of July 1835, agreeably to the provisions of the Act 9 Geo. 4, c. 82, s. 35.

Thomas John, jun.

Youghal, 20 March 1837.

Chairman to Commissioners.

H. Browne, Clerk to Commissioners.

I certify, that I received the foregoing return from Thomas John, jun., Esq., Chairman to the Youghal Gas Commissioners, having applied to him for the same.

Youghal, 20 March 1837.

John Jenkins, Town Clerk.

No person has been discharged from payment of rates under this Act, whose premises are of the value of 5*l.* and upwards.

Thomas John, jun.,

Youghal, 20 March 1837.

Chairman to Commissioners.

H. Browne, Clerk of Commissioners.

Geo. B. Healey, Collector of Gas Tax.

The levy for county grand jury presentment rates, within the town and liberties of Youghal, is made on all premises of the value of 20*s.* and upwards.

Geo. B. Healey.

Youghal, 20 March 1837.

High Constable and Collector County Cess.

Received the above return from Thomas John, jun., Esq., Chairman to the Youghal Gas Commissioners, March 20th, 1837.

John Jenkins, Town Clerk.

Appendix (H.)

A RETURN of the Names and Residences, with the Streets and Numbers of the Houses, of all Persons in Towns in Dublin Collection which return Members to serve in Parliament who have made application for or received Excise Licences for the Sale of Spirits in Premises under the Annual Value of Ten Pounds, since 1st October 1832.

NAME.	Residence.	STREET.	No. of the House.	Spirits Licences granted in each Year since 1 October 1832; commencing—						
				10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	—	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	
Caroline Maher	Dublin	Grafton-court	6	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	—	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	
Henry Kennedy	—	Grafton-court	6	—	—	—	—	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	
Catherine Walsh	—	East James's-st.	7	—	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	—	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	
John Donohoe	—	Great Clarence-st.	1	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	—	—	—	—	
Mary Donohoe	—	Hawkins-street	7	—	10 Oct. 1833	—	—	—	—	
Francis Durn	—	Mess-street	11	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	—	—	—	—	
Michael Roundtree	—	Poolbeg-street	11	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	—	—	—	
John Harkearth	—	Townsend-street	28	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	—	—	—	—	
James M'Call	—	Bow-lane	51	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
William Brown	—	Irwin-street	9	10 Oct. 1832	—	—	—	—	—	
William Whelan	—	Tripp-street	none	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
William Cullen	—	Garden-lane	none	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
James Harverer	—	Marrowbone-lane	53	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
John Cullen	—	Chamber-street	44	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
William Duffy	—	Chamber-street	1	—	5 July 1835	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
John Skerza	—	Upper Kevin-st.	15	—	10 Oct. 1833	—	—	—	—	
James Tandy	—	Upper Kevin-st.	40	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	—	—	—	—	
John Tapley	—	Cross Kevin-street	31	—	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
Julia Conway	—	Cross Kevin-street	33	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	—	—	—	—	
Joseph Watson	—	Cross Kevin-street	33	—	10 Oct. 1834	4 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
James Broughton	—	Park-gate	5	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	—	—	—	
Thomas Murphy	—	Hughlin-street	1	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
Hugh Murphy	—	Hughlin	1	—	—	—	—	9 Feb. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	
Mary Orr	—	George German-lane	none	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
Marg. Magowan	—	Church-street	38	—	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
Marice Coyne	—	Throat-street	151	—	—	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	—	—	
John Smith	—	Lower Liffey	1	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	—	—	—	—	
Francis Pagan	—	Lower Liffey	1	—	—	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	—	—	
James Flaegan	—	Coles-lane	6	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	—	—	—	—	
William Bowes	—	Macklenberg-st.	40	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	—	—	
Thomas Nulty	—	North Strand	3	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	—	—	—	
Michael Connell	—	Cottage-place	none	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	—	—	
Daniel Brady	—	Graham's-court	1	—	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
George Dowdall	—	Circular-road	none	10 Oct. 1832	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
Patrick Bergan	—	Blessington-st.	none	—	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	—	—	
Matthew Raiber	—	Grange German-lane	none	—	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
James Dobson	—	Graham's-court	3	—	10 Oct. 1833	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
Terence Gavin	—	Bread Stone	none	—	—	10 Oct. 1834	10 Oct. 1835	10 Oct. 1836	—	
Patrick M'Garry	—	Newport-street	5	—	—	—	—	10 Oct. 1835	—	
John Thudrr	—	Church-street	139	—	—	—	—	10 Oct. 1835	—	
James Hill	—	Simpson's-court	1	—	—	—	—	10 Oct. 1835	—	
William Gahan	—	Thomas-street	151	—	—	—	—	10 Oct. 1835	—	
Peter Lynch	—	Cool-street	1	—	—	—	—	10 Oct. 1835	—	
James Landy	—	Lower Kevin-st.	35	—	—	—	—	10 Oct. 1835	—	

The Returns for the other Excise collections in Ireland will be made by the Board of Excise.

Excise Office Dublin, 15 March 1837.

George Pope, Collector.